

"THE INFLUENCE OF APOCALYPTIC ESCHATOLOGY ..."

CRAIG

PhD  
1924  
cr  
cop.2



# THESIS

submitted to Boston University in accordance  
with the requirements for the degree of Doctor  
of Philosophy.

## "THE INFLUENCE OF APOCALYPTIC ESCHATOLOGY . ON THE ETHICS OF JESUS."

Clarence Tucker Craig

March 1, 1924.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY  
COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS  
LIBRARY



Jesus Christ

Title

Sec. ed.

Gift of  
The Author  
June, 1924.

22628



PhD  
1924

Contents and Outline of Thesis.

Cr

Chapter I. The Quest of the Historical Jesus. Pages 4 -13.

The rediscovery of the human life of Jesus.- Exaggerated emphasis on the ethics of Jesus - Gospel criticism destroys its own portrait of the "liberal Jesus" - J. Weiss and eschatology - Exaggerations of A. Schweitzer - Reception by Catholic modernists - Rejection by most English-speaking Protestants because endangers "imitation of Christ". Supplementary considerations, (1) Origin of an idea does not determine its value - (2) An inevitable residue of relativity remains besides - (3) Psychological facts must be given due weight. Statement of problem of the thesis.

Chapter II. The Sources of the Life of Jesus in their Bearing upon the Possibility of Development in his Teaching. Pages 14 -24.

The Fourth Gospel has cast off all apocalyptic eschatology - Order of Q topical and not chronological - Matter peculiar to Matthew affords no evidence - Theories of an original Lukan frame-work - Evidence in Luke that narratives are not chronologically arranged. - Failure of lives of Christ based on Markan hypothesis - The newer tradition-criticism in contrast to source-criticism - "Typical Sabbath" - Collection of controversies - Attitudes toward Jesus, and own teaching concerning Himself - Jerusalem days - Markan order gives no basis for theory of development.

Chapter III. Jesus's Conception of the Kingdom of God. Pages 25-40.

The starting-point of Jesus as well as John - Kingdom of Heaven and Kingdom of God - Meaning of the Greek word - Evidence for an apocalyptic Kingdom - Evidence for a present Kingdom - Parables of growth - Due weight must be given to both - Coming of Son of Man not to be separated from coming of the Kingdom - Common relation to the Judgment - "Little Apocalypse" hypothesis does not eliminate apocalyptic from authentic teaching of Jesus - Evolution followed by catastrophe in near future.- Evidence for an "other-worldly" Kingdom - Evidence for Kingdom on earth - but under changed conditions.

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2013

IV. Evidence of Influence from Apocalyptic Eschatology on the Ethics of Jesus. Pages 41- 64.

Call to repentance because of moral qualifications for citizenship in Kingdom - Charge of eudaemonism - Rewards and punishments in relation to the Kingdom - Reward not the result of our striving for we have no claim upon God - Recompense and rejection because of direct consequence - Sin of insincerity - Danger of riches - The unforgiving spirit - Eschatological never the sole motivation - Two classes of "followers"- Relation to demand for severing of family ties - Financial sacrifice of immediate circle - Necessity of enduring persecution - Exhortations to faithfulness - Joy in nearness of the Kingdom - Limits of love influenced by eschatology - Jesus rejected political messianism leading to teaching of refraining from revenge - Love to enemies - New law of service in coming kingdom instead of lordship of Israel - Mark 12:18 and relation to interim-ethic for the family - Interim-ethic a closer approximation of the eternal Kingdom of God - Incompleteness as product of the religious hope.

V. Teachings of Jesus not influenced by apocalyptic. Pages 65 -83

Jesus, the interpreter of the law, as well as the apocalyptic prophet - Ethical inwardness not affected - Inter-change of influence between ethics and eschatology - Speeches on light - Motivation, not the act, made central - Fulfillment of the law, and superseding of the law - Both due to intuition of needs of men - An evidence of his supreme personality - Sins condemned with no reference to eschatology - Forgiving Father the presupposition of Jesus's teaching - His loving care - Over-systematization of "The Lord of Thought" - Fatherhood of God and the idea of Judgment - Brotherly love that knows no bounds - The criterion of greatness - Jesus and the family - Divorce - The breakdown of national exclusiveness - No heathen mission, but an implicit universalism.

VI. The Radicalism of Jesus in Relation to Apocalyptic Eschatology in the History of the Church. Pages 84 - 94.

Chiliasm branded as heretical, so loyalty to the Church tended to exclude apocalyptic - Such the case in the sacramental Church - Common revival of the two elements possibly due to literalism - Troeltsch on the medieval sects - St. Francis and his followers - The Anabaptists - Age of Cromwell - Modern premillennialists and social radicalism - Ideals of Tolstoy - His adaptation of the idea of catastrophe.



VII. Socialism and Apocalyptic. Pages 95 - 104.

Apocalyptic for us an obsolete system of ideas -  
Parallelism in Marxianism - Two wings in both move-  
ments - Agreement to be found in pessimism regard-  
ing present order - Signs of the end - Messianic  
woes - Powerlessness of the individual - Retreat  
of the ethical - The break with nationalism - Value  
of service - Passivism of Jesus and socialism - Je-  
sus's stress upon ethical inwardness - Jesus and ec-  
onomic injustice.

VIII. Modern Values in Apocalyptic Eschatology. 105 - 118

A question of personal evaluation - Three general  
forms which hope may take - Weakness of confidence  
based on evolution - Apocalyptic a challenge to  
reactionary conservatism - Cuts loose from mechanism -  
A coming Kingdom rules out all pantheism - Apocalyp-  
tic grounds a genuinely social hope of immortality -  
The "heroic" ethic of the Gospels - Our task in the  
modern world - Meaning of interim-ethic - Ethics  
of Jesus not a legalism - Apocalyptic an attempted  
solution of the problem of evil - The finite God -  
Parousia expectation not fanaticism but belief in  
God's Holy Will - Religious determinism in apocalyp-  
tic - Irreligion of the deification of man - What  
if Jesus was mistaken? - Frank recognition only way  
to meet the Fundamentalist - An illusion is not only  
that - "Commixtatio Christi" -

Bibliography, pages 119-125.



## Chapter I.

### THE QUEST OF THE HISTORICAL JESUS.



The most distinguishing characteristic of modern Christianity in contrast to all previous expressions is the interest in the human life of Jesus. From the days of the first proclamation of the Messiahship and Lordship of Jesus by those who had been his personal disciples, the emphasis had been on the significance of Jesus for man's salvation rather than the message he himself proclaimed. Even those who insist that every element in the Apostolic preaching roots in Jesus's own message admit that the former is hardly summarized by the teaching of God as Father, the infinite worth of the human soul, and the command to an undivided heart in love to God and man. These elements were never completely forgotten in the most sacramental periods of the Church. But the growth of a philosophical dogma which sought to rationalize the religious relation of man to his Lord, tended to thrust into the background interest in the human life of Jesus. If his complete humanity was always insisted upon in orthodox dogma, the coupling of this with absolute deity made it impossible to rightly consider Jesus within the humbler category of a teacher.

Modern Christianity has frequently gone to the other extreme in its liberal expressions. It has been forgotten that religion, although the sister of morality, is not merely her handmaid. It has not always been remembered that religion is something more than a theistic philosophy and a moral ordered life. Liberal Christianity has often had little understanding for Jesus under any other category than that of teacher. As such it has evaluated him in purely human terms. He proclaimed



(1) "Christianity at the Cross Roads". 1909



the eternal Kingdom of God, an order of moral living which God, the Father, is bringing into consummation. Because of the eternal validity of this truth, Jesus, the human prophet, has for us the worth of the giver of a divine revelation. He proclaims an eternal religious ethic, and therein lies his abiding significance for mankind.

But the progress in gospel criticism which distilled as the historical essence a teacher of surpassing elevation went on to destroy the same. This Jesus was surprisingly modern, but the Gospels contained unmistakable features which were very foreign to our evolutionary and scientific thinking. The Jewish apocalyptic imagery was obviously not eternal. It was therefore a part of the idea-world of the earliest disciples with which they have contaminated the pure teaching of the Master. Others who saw more deeply, insisted that Jesus used this figurative language, but it is to be interpreted symbolically. It was necessary for him to accommodate himself to the vocabulary of his hearers in order to gain popular intelligibility. It was as necessary for him to present his ideas in an apocalyptic mould as for a modern man to speak in terms of evolutionary hypotheses. He himself however stood above these vagaries and the heart of his message was untouched by these outer garments which protected it from the blasts of opposition in the birth hours of the Kingdom. One cannot refrain from quoting the trenchant words of Father Tyrrell on this delusion, "To pretend that Jesus regarded His apocalyptic portrayal of the transcendent as symbolic is to pretend that His mind belonged to the nineteenth century." (1)

The critical nature of the problem was not sufficiently grasped until the attempt was made to write the life of



(1) "Geschichte der Leben-Jesu Forschung" 2d. Auf.  
Page 596.



purpose of dying and thus hasten the apocalyptic Kingdom. Judas betrays the Messianic secret which precipitates the catastrophe. With all its superficial points of contact with the traditional reconstruction of the life of Christ, it leaves not a shred of the preacher of an eternal morality. As Schweitzer himself says, "The attempt to derive our ethic as a whole from that announced by Jesus is senseless and absurd." (1)

Catholic modernists have been among the few who have accepted the full "eschatological Gospel." Father Tyrrell shows clearly his satisfaction with the idea of a "Heilsgut" completely disassociated from moral humanity and belonging to an entirely new spiritual and supernatural order. The Church which can mediate this is in the direct line of development from an apocalyptic Jesus. Loisy states explicitly, "It is superfluous to seek in the Gospel a doctrine of social and political economy or only a program of moral conduct for the lives of individuals, which ought to unfold according to the order of nature in the indefinitely-extended course of humanity. To wish to discover all those things in the teaching of Jesus exposes one to the contrary discovery of precepts whose observation awaits shortly the ruin of human society, having been given in expectation of the immediate end....Whether it is its merit or fault, or now one and now the other, all the morality of the Gospel is subordinated to the eschatological conception of the rule of God. That has gone. If one attempts to detach it, to take it only as an essential element of the Gospel and of the heavenly Kingdom, as the essence of faith and religion, and at the same time as a sufficient instruction



(1) Alfred Loisy, "Jesus et la tradition Evangelique". 1910  
Paris. Pages 141, 143-4



for the direction of the individual, the institution of the family, and the organization of society at all times, one will have only an incomplete doctrine, sublime perhaps, but impractical, hurled as a permanent defy at the experience of men and the reality of things." (1)

The attitude that most modern writers, especially English, have accepted is the one laid down by Schweitzer in his "either-or" refuge - either all apocalyptic or none. Not slow in recognizing the exaggerations in his portrayal they have shouted loudly "none". They have gone through the ethical teachings of Jesus to point out that the motivation is in every case religious, not eschatological. Never, as Paul (I Cor. 7:29) does Christ issue an injunction "because the time is shortened." Though apocalyptic imagery surrounds the "coming of the Son of Man", and the Kingdom is certainly future if it is in some sense present, yet the ethical maxims of Jesus were unaffected and can be extracted without injury from the temporal setting. Through it all runs the unexpressed conviction that if it could be proved that Jesus's message was essentially affected by the limitations of the thought world of his time, his significance for us, and much more, any faith in his divinity would be removed. There has been the tacit assumption that apocalyptic influence must be negative in value, and all positive worth is excluded from consideration. Crassly stated, the "imitation of Christ" is a false ideal if his teaching was wrapped up with the illusion that the Son of Man would come after a very short time to set up the Kingdom with power.

But three considerations must be born in mind. First,



the origin of an idea never determines its value. Truths may be grasped under the stimulus of special emergencies which are valid not merely under those circumstances but contain permanent insight. The crisis has made clear that which would have been less apparent but for the emergency. The origin of the idea is conditioned by the special circumstances; its validity however may or may not be conditioned by them. The recent war emergencies called forth customs that have survived the original motivation because of their inherent value. There is of course no complete analogy between this and the background of the teaching of Jesus, but it illustrates the truth that is frequently overlooked; factors<sup>~</sup> that were an essential element in the origination of an idea or invention in no way prejudice its permanent validity. Questions of value are never determined by origin.

Second; there is an inevitable residue of relativity in the teaching of Jesus quite apart from eschatology. That is merely one factor. To write on the Ethics of Jesus, as one would of the moral teaching of Aristotle, Kant, or Spinoza is to misconstrue his message. Jesus was primarily a religious prophet; he was the very antithesis of the builder of an ethical system. Jesus built upon the background of the Old Testament. The categories of duty, virtue, and highest good do not cover his maxims for his premises are strictly religious. When a man sits down at his desk to write a scientific treatise on moral motives and ideals he may well seek timeless generalities of eternal validity and universal application. He will seek to exclude all temporary factors. Yet one can never understand



even Kant or Spencer without considering the national and cultural influences that entered into their ideals. When one takes seriously the humanity of Jesus, it must be realized that we have to do with the teaching of a Jew, of the East, of antiquity, who wrote no books, but whose words, that come down to us, were treasured by devoted disciples from his occasional preaching and teaching. They were words addressed to particular audiences of Galilean peasants, or hostile ecclesiastical leaders of his people, or to his chosen band of helpers. All these elements which are undebatable, make it impossible to exclude all relativity from the individual words of Jesus. It is right to protest against the literalness of a man like Tolstoy in his interpretation of Jesus. But the heroic passion of Jesus is not relative to any age, if its expressions may be. We are straining out the gnat while we swallow the camel if we exclude the apocalyptic as temporary and relative, and overlook the fact that much remains that is also temporary and relative.

Third, it appears to us further that those eliminating vital apocalyptic influence have not duly weighed the psychological aspect. It must be asserted at the outset that human personality can unite, as does a magnet, very opposite poles. Paul was certain that he was already a new creature in Christ, (II Cor. 5:17) but final salvation lay still in the future. (Rom. 8:23) So we must not exclude the probability of such a polarity in Jesus. Abstract thinkers see the logical necessity for "either-or". Living, creative men are always bigger than a "system". So we protest when a writer who is obviously endeavoring to do justice to the apocalyptic element in Jesus falls into such an unfortunate phrase as, "Jesus chose the apocalyptic form of expression



(1) Wm. Manson, "Christ's View of the Kingdom of God." 1918. Page 79.



because better than any other existing in His time, it enabled Him to present a spiritual idea of God's Kingdom and His righteousness." (1) Are we to suppose that after due deliberation over several alternatives, Jesus "chose" the apocalyptic form? True, that does not give the new and original in Jesus. It is part of the heritage he received from the contemporary religious conceptions of his people. It is the theme of his great predecessor, John the Baptist. But that does not mean it did not become a genuine reality for Him. It is much more to the point to say, "What to the people of his time was merely a hope, was to Jesus a certainty." The greatest originality in Jesus lay in his selection from the treasure house of the most religious people of antiquity, and in giving power to those ideas in his own personality. We are subtracting from his greatness rather than adding to it in ascribing to him such accidental appropriation of truth. We may discover in the course of our investigation that Jesus never gave an express eschatological motivation. It is nevertheless artificial to conclude that the ethical teaching of Jesus was utterly independent of the apocalyptic conception that he may have simultaneously held. By every analogy we must expect some inter-relation. It will be our endeavor to discover that as far as possible and consider the question of evaluation.

The compass and purpose of our thesis is thus stated. We will not enter upon the pretentious objective of reconstructing anew the teaching of Jesus in its entirety, though we cannot refrain from a discussion of the central problem of Jesus's idea of the Kingdom. We will not write an "Ethics of Jesus", for it seems to us that such a program misconstrues the nature



of his teaching and seeks a system where none is to be found, throwing out questions which are misleading and unanswerable.

(Such as Jesus's attitude toward the State. From the fragmentary data mirroring totally different surroundings, modern authors usually reconstruct a picture corresponding closely to their own predilections. Grimm (Die Ethik Jesu) for example has used the figure of a "work of art" which will be appreciated from different points of view in different centuries. Such opposites as the absolute pacifist and the bellicose militarist have sought and found support for their philosophies in the words of Jesus.)

We will rather investigate anew the more modest problem of the nature of the influence of apocalyptic eschatology upon the ethical teaching of Jesus. It is not beyond belief that one of the first influences may have been to make its presentation occasional and unsystematic.



## Chapter 2.

### THE SOURCES OF THE LIFE OF JESUS

### IN THEIR BEARING UPON THE POSSIBILITY

### OF DEVELOPMENT IN HIS TEACHING.



(10) Holtzman, Keim, Renan, Beyschlag, B. Weiss, etc.

(2) John 5:25-29. When we contrast this with the Apocalypse that tradition has assigned to the same author, one is driven to consider such authorship a psychological impossibility. Yet caution is necessary when we see how Paul could combine a certainty of present salvation with apocalyptic ideas by which salvation was first consummated at the Parousia.



An examination of the sources for the ministry of Jesus must precede the major investigation in order to ascertain whether we need consider the possibility that Jesus passed through various stages of development in his religious outlook. This assumption has been the frequent refuge of interpreters endeavoring to portray a consistent life of Christ. (1)

We can eliminate the Fourth Gospel at once from our consideration. True, it marks a period of early popularity followed by waning success (Jm. 6:66), but for the apocalyptic problem that stands in the fore-ground of our investigation it offers no aid. Ethical teachings recede entirely before the disputes over the Sonship of Jesus, and discourses over the new birth, Life, and Light. Eternal Life and Judgment are so spiritualized and thrown into the present that the conceptions derived from Jewish apocalyptic shimmer through only occasionally as remnants of a tradition no longer vital to the author. (2) Whether he was John the son of Zebedee, or the Presbyter, or a disciple of one or the other; whether we have to do with any considerable material that can claim historical value which is independent of the Synoptics, are questions which are as irrelevant to our purpose as they are difficult of demonstration.

When we turn to the Synoptic Gospels, we are safe in asserting as an assured result of criticism that Mark is the oldest and is used by Matthew and Luke. To it we will return, as Mark is the basis for most of the theories of stages of development. As a second result of modern criticism we must name the fact that Matthew and Luke had a common source or



sources. This consisted almost exclusively of teaching. The Temptation story (Mt. 4:1-11 and par.), and the healing of the Centurion's servant, which are usually included, (Mt. 8:5-13 and par.) form hardly an exception for the compiler may well have considered the words of Jesus unclear without the setting. But we must be cautious in referring to Q as a document; it is rather the most satisfactory hypothesis in accounting for the literary phenomena of the Gospels; it expresses our faith that there was a document. Whether Matthew and Luke used Q in the same Greek translation, whether they had documents of the same compass or whether Q was a growing body of material, whether it was used by Mark or entirely independent of his tradition, - these are all questions which admit of opinions rather than proofs. Hence when a writer presumes to speculate on the order of Q, we will hesitate in allowing objectivity to his results. (B. H. Streeter in "Oxford Studies in the Syn. Prob." Pg. 141 ff.) But if they were established, it would prove only the topical order followed by Q, and not a chronological order in the life of Jesus. The most recent investigators, from the most radical to the most conservative ( i. e. Bultman and Soiron) have brought complete demonstration of the disposition of the material according to theme or "catch-word". We can draw then no sure conclusions from Q as to development in the teaching of Jesus.

An investigation of the material found only in Matthew permits of no evidence for development beyond what may be found in Mark. The teaching peculiar to him is inserted into the matter from Q according to theme or catch-word. The few bits of narrative peculiar to the first evangelist do not effect our problem. (Mt. 17:24-7; 16:17-19: 9:27-34 ?) To ask, for



instance, whether Matthew or Luke has the correct setting for Jesus' speech against the Pharisees is to misunderstand entirely the conditions under which the evangelists wrote. It is altogether probable that neither was in possession of information on such points. The first evangelist would need no special tradition in order to be led to place the Parousia-parables in the last days at Jerusalem rather than in Galilee where he assigns some which are peculiar to his Gospel. J. Weiss raised the question ("Das Älteste Evangelium" 1903) whether Matthew did not have a special source containing the material from 8:1 to 9:34. Here the order varies from that in Mark. The more usual explanation is that Matthew has grouped together healings and mighty works in the same way he built up the great sermon in chapters 5-7 from scattered sayings. A decision is unnecessary however for our purpose for these chapters do not show "development".

When we come to Luke we have a more difficult problem. Spitta ("Die Synoptische Grundschrift" 1912) has sought to prove that Luke is our earliest Gospel. This theory has received practically no favorable reception. Preconceptions as to historical probability cannot determine literary judgments. B. E. Streeter has come out for Luke in an entirely different way. (Hibbert Journal, Sept. 1921) Adopting the phraseology of Sir John Hawkins, he questions the validity of speaking of a shorter insertion into the Markan body of narrative (6:20-8:3) and also a longer, (9:51-18:14) Luke's opening is peculiar to himself (4:16-30) and his story of the Passion presents deviations in order and a lack of agreement in words where the order is the same to a degree greater than elsewhere in his Gospel.



(1) It must be pointed out that the chronological data, (3:1-2) the preaching of John the Baptist (3:10-14 19-20), genealogy (3:23-38, temptation (4:1-13, opening at Nazareth (4:16-30) and the calling of Peter (5:1-11) make a unity from which it is difficult to extract Mark.

Is Lk. 3:22 D evidence for an independent account of the baptism?

The remarkable coincidences in the uniting of Q with Mark in the account of the preaching of the Baptist is very strong evidence that Luke knew Matthew as well as Mark.



The conjecture has often been made that he followed a separate source for the Passion story. But since the Markan material would then extend only from 3:3-6:19, and 8:4-9:50, and 18:15-43, it would be much more to the point, suggests Streeter, to speak of Markan insertions into a separate Lukan narrative. We do not expect that this theory will receive general recognition, although it presents an adequate explanation of Luke's omission of Mark 6:45-8:26. But if we concede that Luke gives us a primary, independent order of events, it does not afford evidence for a theory of development.

Following the first Markan section (1), the evangelist gives his shorter version of the Sermon on the Mount. Its construction is undoubtedly due to the tradition which collected words of Jesus without thought of time or place, but according to considerations of aids to the memory and their use in instruction. Of the five narratives that follow, only the first two have any geographical location, Caphernaum and Nain. All lack definite temporal reference. ἐπειδὴ ἐπλήρωσεν πάντα τὰ <sup>ῥήματα</sup> (7:1) is a logical connection, a transition due to the evangelist and no part of the tradition. We have no grounds for believing that Luke had any better information than Matthew as to the place of the incident in Jesus's ministry. Every indication leads to the conclusion that the Gospel tradition was pericope in form, individual stories circulating separately. When the healing of the widow's son that follows is ἐν τῷ ἑξῆς (7:11), we have no warrant in concluding that it is "the day following" the preceding words. Rather it is the conventional introduction to an entirely independent narrative. 8:1 is to be similarly judged. (ἐν τῷ καθ' ἑξῆς)



It would needlessly expand this chapter to go through the second body of Lukan narrative, 9:51-18:14. It has long been an axiom of synoptic criticism that the evangelist has here strung along a body of material in the form of a journey through Peraea, through which he had no idea of temporal sequence nor of geographical location. K. L. Schmidt ("Der Rahmen des Lebens Jesu" 246 ff.) has carefully analyzed the section and clearly shown the secondary character of the framework. We would entirely forget the fact that Jesus was on his way to Jerusalem (9:53) if the evangelist did not remind us of his literary scheme from time to time. (9:57; 10:38; 13:22; 17:11) It would be entirely arbitrary hence to draw any conclusions as to development in the teaching of Jesus from the order in Luke.

We must now return to the consideration of Mark, for it has been on the basis of its narrative, which certainly determines the order in Matthew and most probably also in Luke, that the more recent "lives of Jesus" have been constructed. Burkitt ("The Gospel History and its Transmission") thought that Mark gave a really intelligible account of the life of Jesus, motivating the culmination of the opposition in the healing of the man with the withered hand on the sabbath. (3:6) The Herodian government closed the synagogues to him and Jesus is soon compelled to lead a wandering life to the east and north. Such a narrative as that by O. Holtzman attempts to work it out in detail. But the attempt led only to greater skepticism regarding Mark. 6:45-8:26 was often regarded as a second, parallel and less trustworthy account, and no part of the original, historical, Urmarkus. Wellhausen, writing in



(1) The theory of parables as hidden mysteries (4:11);  
that Jesus demanded silence of the demons who recog-  
nized his Messiahship, etc.

(2) M. Dibelius, "Formgeschichte der Evangelien". 1919  
R. Bultman, "Die Geschichte der Synoptischen  
Tradition." 1921  
Albertz, "Die Synoptische Streit-gesprache", 1921



his Commentary (page 62) says of 8:27, "Now begins the Gospel as the Apostles proclaimed it; He (Jesus) no longer teaches general doctrines but prophecies about himself." Wendling made the most detailed analysis of the second Gospel into its three successive stages ("Die Entstehung des Markus"), and Wrede showed to what heights of skepticism criticism was driven by its own over-valuation of Mark. ("Das Messiasgeheimnis" 1901) One result was app<sup>a</sup>rent; the attempt to distill an authentic, chronological Ur-Markus from our second Gospel, which would give us the outlines of the course of the life of Jesus had failed. We believe that much of this criticism was unwarrantably negative, but there can no longer be any doubt but that our earliest evangelist is not merely an objective reporter but interprets from his faith, and is ruled by theories that probably are no part of the tradition that came to him. (1)

In this zealous search for the more reliable Ur-markus, the truth in the oral theories of transmission had been too largely neglected. Mark may have had written sources but the promulgator of one of the most recent theories exercises a praise-worthy caution in defining their limits. (E. Meyer "Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums" Bd. I, pg. 121) But the more important factor is the period of oral transmission which extended over at least thirty years. It is with a truer apprehension of this factor that the most recent investigators in the field of "tradition-criticism" have worked. (2) They point out that our problem is not to estimate Gospels, but individual narratives. Each narrative was originally separate and must be judged for itself. Its historicity does not depend on its derivation from an unknown



(1) Our English translation would give no indication that the original is plural, τοῖς σαββατοῖς.



X called Ur-Markus. This "pericope" tradition was originally without temporal sequence and usually without geographical setting. Just which place and time notes belonged to the oral fragment, and which to the evangelist's frame-work are separate subjects for debate. But the judgment in principle of the material as composed originally of separate narratives appears to us as an established result of criticism.

Reference to Peter as the source of Mark's information does not satisfactorily explain why he gives us so full an account of one Sabbath in Capernaum (1:21-34) and others are passed over with the briefest summaries (1:39). It is rather a typical Sabbath (1) and the final calling of Peter may well have come later as Luke gives it, which would afford more psychological preparation. Matthew brings the incident in Peter's house in no connection with this Sabbath and completely breaks up the scheme.

With 2:1 we are inclined to see with Albertz (op. cit. pg. 5f) the beginning of a distinct collection of Galilean controversies that lay before the evangelist, possibly in documentary form. They are clearly arranged in climactic order, leading up to the decision to slay Jesus, which of course proves nothing for the actual temporal sequence. This hypothesis gives the best explanation yet offered for the presence of the title for Jesus, *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* (2:10; 2:28) in contrast to the scheme of the evangelist himself. We are not helped in these passages by pointing out that the original Aramaic may have been simply "man", for the point of the story as moulded for use in preaching in the oral tradition, was to assert the prerogatives of the Messiah. When Mark adds a



(1) Unless one admits the strong apocalyptic motivation of the proclamation of the Kingdom, it seems to me that this mission must abide a riddle or else be recognized as a reading back into the life of Jesus of the earliest preaching. The latter is the course followed by many liberal critics.

(2) The attempt of Bultman (op. cit.; pg. 156) to relate the verse to what precedes is an utterly arbitrary refuge of despair to win support from the text for his denial of the belief of Jesus in his own Messiahship.



further dispute in the same chapter (3:20-30), and later a controversy over purification (7:1-14) and one over divorce (10:1-12) without there being evidence of a sharpening of the hatred expressed in 3:6, we are led to conclude that these came to Mark separately.

After the collection of parables in chapter 4, the evangelist arranges three different wonder-works to show the divine power of Jesus. Such faith as the woman with the issue of blood reveals (5:25-34) is shown in marked contrast to the unbelief of his own townsmen and relatives (6:1-6). The historicity of the mission of the Twelve cannot be discussed apart from the reconstruction of the aims and program of Jesus, but in any case the incident has no fast place in a chronological tradition. (1) Mark uses this absence of the disciples to record the death of John the Baptist. But it is clear from 6:16 that this event lay some time in the past. We are inclined to be less skeptical of the part Herod played in the withdrawal of Jesus from Galilee than is often the case. Though the goalless wandering hither and thither through the succeeding chapters is due to the pericope form of the tradition and not the recollection of the outlines of an itinerary, we are not warranted in suspecting the truth of this cause for the withdrawal. The name of Caesarea Philippi in Peter's confession (8:27) is the stone of offence against which every skeptic must stumble. (2) Mark may have preserved <sup>o</sup>dublets. That does not prove an earlier recension of our Gospel, but varying accounts which the evangelist does not distinguish. The "Gospel" as preached in Mark's own day may color his narrative more from 8:27-10:45 but there is every psychological reason to believe that Jesus



(1) It may be true that these words are a quotation from "The Wisdom of God", rather than original with Jesus, for which thesis Luke gives some support. Yet the number of acquaintances of Jesus in and about Jerusalem must lead us to posit a longer period than one week. This however does not establish John's schematic visitation of feasts stretching over a period of three Passovers.

(2) Despite the pragmatism of John's date for the crucifixion, it is to be preferred to that of Mark. The decision of the priests and scribes to kill him before the Passover (14:2), the fact that they have leavened bread (*apros* 14:22) and that Simon of Cyrene is coming from work (15:21) combine to indicate that Jesus was not crucified on the first day of the feast. Mark is probably correct in the hour however. John has conformed to the time of the slaying of the Passover-lamb!

(3)



reckoned with the probability of suffering and death as his fate.

When we come to the Jerusalem days, we have even more right to expect that Mark should give us accurate chronological information. The days are all clearly marked, but the evangelist is in fact too definite. The conservative critics who make much of the lament of Jesus over Jerusalem (Mt. 23:37-9 and par.) as substantiating the Johannine chronology have at least shown that the few days Mark allots <sup>are</sup> ~~is~~ entirely too short a period. (1) On the other hand, much of the teaching Mark assigns to these days may just as well come from Galilee. Albertz is probably correct again in finding in Mk. 11:27- 12:37 a collection of controversies between Jesus and his opponents which came to the evangelist in this form. It is a Jerusalem collection, but it does not necessarily follow that they all took place in the Holy City on one day. The "pragmatism" of the parable of the vinyard (12:1-12) corresponds to the "motif" in 8:26 - 10:45 rather than the controversies which the parable interrupts. In these the break is much less apparent and his approaching death hardly casts a shadow. Whether the "Little Apocalypse" (13:5-37) contains essentially words of Jesus or is an early Christian writing coming from the beginning of the Jewish wars which the evangelist has incorporated, it is clearly independent of the word about the destruction of the Temple. (13:2) If Jesus's idea of the Kingdom was essentially apocalyptic, there is no reason why even his first preaching might not have been accompanied by such traditional imagery as this chapter portrays. Even in the passion story itself inner chronological inconsistencies are not wanting. (2)



(1) Eusebius, "Ecclesiastical History" III, 39:15.



Enough has been shown to make clear how impossible it is to construct any theory of development of the basis of the Markan narrative. Though Papias was probably comparing his order with what he found in John rather than with any other information not accessible to us, we must agree with his judgment that Mark wrote "not in order". (1) We may assign material early or late on the ground of inherent probability, but these opinions can never claim objective certainty. We are restricted by our sources to an account of the main features in the ministry of Jesus; we can give no connected account, much less write a "life of Christ".

This brief summary of the results of synoptic criticism that commend themselves to us makes no claim to presenting original investigations or new conclusions. They have been all-too briefly considered and the contrary arguments not sufficiently considered for an original study. The purpose of the survey has simply been to summarize the results of such studies which exclude the hypothesis of different stages in the ministry of Jesus, in which the apocalyptic element is of varying importance. Since our Gospels are composed of fragments of tradition of greater and less authenticity arranged by writers who had very inadequate information as to the real chronological sequence, any theory of development is arbitrary and subjective.



### Chapter III

#### JESUS'S CONCEPTION OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD.

MARK 1:15; MAT 23:13; LUKE 11:20; ACTS 1:3 (12)

...THEY ARE NOT OF THIS WORLD...







Jesus began his ministry in Galilee by taking up the words of John the Baptist, "Repent, for the Kingdom of God is at hand." (Mk. 1:15; Mt. 3:2, 4:17) For various reasons, modern interpreters (2) have gone out from some other starting point in portraying the message of Jesus. But in order to estimate the influence of apocalyptic, we must first determine what Jesus meant by the nearness of the Kingdom. There can be no doubt but that John expected the judgment, "the wrath to come"; for "the axe was already laid at the root of the tree"; there was but a short respite for repentance before God should intervene. This would not mean blessedness for the entire nation, for only those who brought forth fruit worthy of repentance would have a part in the coming Kingdom. On the other side blazed the unquenchable fire of divine wrath?

It does not follow necessarily that the same words in the mouth of Jesus, "The Kingdom of God is at hand", bore a like connotation. Words do not create ideas; they are rather the inadequate symbols of that which we imperfectly endeavor to convey to men. The Gospels however give no indication that Jesus felt it necessary to define his term. It is presupposed that everyone knew what was meant by the Kingdom. Pious Jews had long awaited its coming. The weight of the message lies in the conviction that it was near.

Two questions must be considered briefly before we examine more closely the development of the Gospel of the Kingdom in the preaching of Jesus. Matthew uses with a few exceptions (2) the phrase ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν instead of the τοῦ θεοῦ in Mark and Luke. Are these to be distinguished? If not, which is the correct rendering of the phrase used by Jesus. When we



(1) Βασιλεία τοῦ πατρὸς μου (Mt 26<sup>29</sup>) ὅς  
οὐκ ἔστιν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ (Mt 16<sup>28</sup>)  
ἡ ζωὴ (Mt 18<sup>2</sup>).

(2) See Dalman, "Die Worte Jesu", pag. 162 ff.

(3) Holtzman, Feine, Dalman, etc.

(4) Mk. 9:47; 10:14, 15, 23, 24, 25; Mt. 7:21; 21:33  
25:34; 23:15.



find Matthew changing the Markan phraseology in successive verses (Mt. 19:23-4 cp. Mk. 10:23-5), though he is clearly following the text of the earlier Gospel, there is a strong presumption in favor of the identity of the ideas. Of the 14 instances in which Mark uses the phrase, *ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ* 4 are omitted by Matthew, seven are given in his favorite terminology, while 3 are rendered by some other periphrasis of the idea of the Kingdom. (1) In late Judaism there was a hesitancy about uttering the divine name. Hence it is altogether likely that Matthew is not thinking, in contrast to the other Gospels, of a Kingdom IN Heaven, to which the saints will some time go. Rather, Heaven is an expression for God, as "The Most High", the "Place", "The Ancient of Days", etc. (2) It is improbable that Jesus uttered the divine name any more than the pious among his contemporaries. He spoke rather of "my Father". Matthew is translating the original Semitic phrase with true Jewish reserve; Mark and Luke adopt on the other hand the phraseology of the Septuagint which consistently renders it *ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ Θεοῦ* as more intelligible to Hellenistic readers.

A second preliminary question is the meaning of the word *βασιλεία*. Is it a Kingdom, or is the word used in the abstract sense of rule or sovereignty? It is the consensus of opinion among modern scholars that the Aramaic phrase *ܠܗ ܕܥܠܡܝܢ* (ܠܗ ܕܥܠܡܝܢ) means the abstract rule of God rather than a spatial kingdom. (3) God's rule is co-terminous with the acceptance of His law. Hence it is possible to "enter into the Kingdom" and "receive the Kingdom" without thinking primarily in spatial terms. (4) Indeed it is very difficult to see how a man could be "not far from the Kingdom" (Mk. 12:34) un-



(1) Mk. 14:25; Lk. 14:15; Lk. 22:30. Here it is  
"My Kingdom."

(2) Mt. 11:11- Lk. 7:28; Mt. 8:11- Lk. 13:28;  
Mt. 5:19; also Mt. 18:1-4. In individual cases  
the evangelists have clearly in mind that the  
visible Church is the "place".

(3) Mt. 21:21. Mark it is true has *ἐν τῇ δόξῃ σου*  
but there is no reason to doubt that the idea  
is of a coming spatial rule.



less it were meant in the abstract sense of rule. No movement in space, be it short or long, would lead the scribe into the promised Kingdom. And yet there are passages which must just as clearly refer to a place. To eat and drink in the Kingdom is something very concrete and local. (1) When "he that is least in the Kingdom" is singled out, (2) or ambitious disciples seek the honored placed to the left and right of Christ, (3) the transition has been made to an actual Kingdom. The idea of the rule of Jehovah over all the earth in the days to come, which is not wanting in the Old Testament (Obadiah 21, Zech. 14:19) was influenced by the book of Daniel, where the fourth Kingdom (Dan. 7:23f.) was to replace the world Empires that had gone before. It appears evident from this survey that the Gospels have no unitary usage on this point. We must admit therefore a strong presupposition in favor of the possibility that the whole idea of the Kingdom with Jesus can be compressed into no single framework. To anticipate our further discussion, if the sovereignty of God no longer suffers restriction, that which was before simply the abstract rule, has become a localized sphere of divine government.

Returning to the original course of our investigation, we find many clear indications that Jesus expected an apocalyptic Kingdom in the near future as did John the Baptist. The disciples are taught to pray "Thy Kingdom come" (Mt. 6:10, Lk. 11:2). The nearness of the Kingdom is the burden of their proclamation when they preach two by two in Galilee. (Mt. 10:7; Lk. 9:2; 10:9, 11). In the time of the great reversal, the hungry will be satisfied, the merciful will obtain mercy, the peace-makers, <sup>and</sup> those persecuted for righteousness' sake, shall reap their deserved reward.



91) As Peabody, in "New Testament Eschatology and New Testament Ethics", in the Transaction of the Third International Congress of Historical Religions". 1908.



It would needlessly expand this chapter to go through the second body of Lukan narrative, 9:51-18:14. It has long been an axiom of synoptic criticism that the evangelist has here strung along a body of material in the form of a journey through Peraea, through which he had no idea of temporal sequence nor of geographical location. K. L. Schmidt ("Der Rahmen des Lebens Jesu" 246 ff.) has carefully analyzed the section and clearly shown the secondary character of the framework. We would entirely forget the fact that Jesus was on his way to Jerusalem (9:53) if the evangelist did not remind us of his literary scheme from time to time. (9:57; 10:38; 13:22; 17:11) It would be entirely arbitrary hence to draw any conclusions as to development in the teaching of Jesus from the order in Luke.

We must now return to the consideration of Mark, for it has been on the basis of its narrative, which certainly determines the order in Matthew and most probably also in Luke, that the more recent "lives of Jesus" have been constructed. Burkitt ("The Gospel History and its Transmission") thought that Mark gave a really intelligible account of the life of Jesus, motivating the culmination of the opposition in the healing of the man with the withered hand on the sabbath. (3:6) The Herodian government closed the synagogues to him and Jesus is soon compelled to lead a wandering life to the east and north. Such a narrative as that by O. Holtzman attempts to work it out in detail. But the attempt led only to greater skepticism regarding Mark. 6:45-8:26 was often regarded as a second, parallel and less trustworthy account, and no part of the original, historical, Urmarkus. Wellhausen, writing in



The Kingdom will belong to those who are poor in spirit, lowly of heart

(1) The possibility must be reckoned with that we have a later Christian addition in Mt. 11:11b; the Kingdom is the Church; its most insignificant member is greater than the greatest without.

Mt. 11:12 - Lk. 16:16 cannot be used in a reconstruction of Jesus' idea of the Kingdom for its meaning is absolutely obscure. Our personal preference is for the interpretation of Zahn, Deissman, and others who take the first *βίαια* as medial rather than passive; "comes like a storm." Is this an approval of the enthusiasm of his followers? Or are J. Weiss and others right in seeing here a polemic against the zelots. One thing alone appears clear, that Jesus sees the dawn of the Kingdom in his work, and that John belongs to the other side of the water-shed. But are we to find here polemic against the disciples of John whom the author of the Fourth Gospel kindly but firmly combats? Dalman thinks the violence refers to the beheading of John the Baptist.

(2) Luke's mission of the 70 is a doublet from Q of the mission of the 12 in Mark.



John and all others who merely hoped for the coming consummation and did not perceive the mystery of these beginnings belonged yet to the old. (Mt. 11:11-Lk. 7:24) (1) When the disciples return from their missionary work enthused over the fact that even the demons are subject unto them, Jesus exclaims, "I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven." (Lk. 10:17) (2) It is because the beginnings are already at hand that Jesus can say, "Blessed are the eyes which see the things that ye see; for I say unto you that many prophets and kings desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not; and to hear the things which ye hear, and heard them not." (Lk. 10:23 ff.- Mt. 13:16 f.)

Luke 17:21 is frequently cited as proof that the Kingdom was looked upon as present by Jesus. "The Kingdom of God is within you" is certainly the wrong translation, no matter how true the idea may be. One dubious passage is insufficient to attribute to Jesus the idea quite foreign to his people, that of an inner spiritual Kingdom. He would certainly not have said that it was "within" those whom he elsewhere called "offspring of vipers". The connection with the following verses may well be due to the evangelist, but it would be a strange transition from speaking of the Kingdom which was already "within their midst" to the eschatological picture of the judgment. It is just of the time of this consummation that the Pharisees ask. The earliest Latin translations give the puzzling preposition *in tua manu*, "in your power". Interpreters have united this with the Rabbinic idea that if Israel only kept two Sabbaths perfectly, God would send the Kingdom. Men could compel the Kingdom through their own repentance. But God alone could set up the Kingdom. It was not a human task. The key to the answer must be found in the question. The pharisees ask for the "signs" of the Kingdom. Jesus rejects any attempt to reckon the time. (Mk. 13:32) That is in God's hand. It will be as unexpected as the flood in the days of Noah. Simply, lo it is unexpectedly in their midst in the hour when men expect it not. (Mk. 13:35) In any case, the verse does not go farther in asserting a present Kingdom than the passages quoted above.

Similarly must we judge with the word about the children. (Mk. 10:13-16 and par.) Jesus does not say that the children are already members of the Kingdom; he never identifies his followers with the Kingdom. Rather, those of such mind will possess it when it comes. The child is the model for the Kingdom not only because of his receptivity, but because his promise is of the future. True, in Mark 10:15 we find the words,



(1) See J. Weiss, Weinell, and others.



"Except ye receive the Kingdom as a little child". But the last clause speaks of "entering into" it. The general idea is the same as in the thanksgiving, "I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that Thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding and reveal them unto babes."

Not only do these few passages presuppose a present Kingdom, but it seems also to be indicated in a group of parables teaching growth. (Mt. 13:33, Mk. 4:30 ff. Mt. 23:24 and parallels). This interpretation however cannot be claimed for the parable of the sower. The expression ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ does not occur in any of the Gospels in the narrative of the parable. The greater probability lies in the view that the explanation which transforms the story into an allegory of four different kinds of fields is not from Jesus himself. But in this interpretation, the seed is the "word", not the Kingdom. Only Matthew adds the genitive τοῦ βασιλείας (Mt. 13:19) to define the nature of the "word". It does not follow that the Kingdom itself is already at hand, rather the word announcing the Kingdom. Hence the possibility must be reckoned with, that in the other parables of growth it is the "word" and not the Kingdom that gradually develops and expands. (1) But if on other grounds we must recognize Jesus's belief in a certain presence of the powers of the Kingdom in the activities going out from his own person, we need not reject the belief and teaching that these which began as a bit of leaven would finally leaven the whole lump (Mt. 13:33- Lk. 13:20); if they now appeared but as a little thing, this was no cause for discouragement for the smallest seeds brought forth at times the largest results. (Mk. 4:30 and par.) The certainty of this growth lay not in human effort, but in the same divine powers that brought forth the grain from the seed. (Mk. 4:26 ff.) They must simply wait upon the harvest (i. e., the judgment in apocalyptic



[illegible]



symbol). These parables of growth give no indication of the duration of the development. We are accustomed to think of evolution as a slow process, but leaven operates in a single night and seeds ripen at best in six months.

(In the parable of the tares, the Kingdom is without doubt the Church. (Mt. 13:24-30, 36-42) Evil and good do not develop side by side in the Kingdom as conceived in the other parables of growth, only in the empirical Church known to the moralistic evangelist whose key-note is righteousness. The Church he knew resembled more the figure of Noah's ark, with all animals both clean and unclean, than the perfected reign of God in embryo. It would be going too far to insist that the allegory we have is only an adaptation of the parable in Mark 4:26 ff. Jesus may have given such an illustration. But the evil was no part of the coming Kingdom. We must recognize (with Jülicher) that such phrases as *ὡμοιωθεὶς ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν* are introductory formulas to be ascribed to the evangelists and not integral parts of the parable itself.)

We should reject all attempts to harmonize the view of the Kingdom in these passages with the eschatological good in Matthew 10:7. The presence of the Kingdom in his own works, the beginnings which might be likened unto a mustard seed, are not what is meant by the nearness of the Kingdom in Matthew 4:17. Holtzman, though granting a wide use of the presence of the Kingdom than has seemed possible to us, has expressed this clearly in the words, "To the present belongs the Kingdom into which even now sinners are entering if they can attain the performances of conversion and faith. Even so certain on the contrary belongs the Kingdom of which the future beatitudes (Mt. 5:4-9 Lk. 6:21 ff.) speak, the Kingdom in which all the injustice and cruelty of the present will be compensated, to the future." (1)

The attempt has been made to break the force of the eschatological references to the Kingdom and to make the idea of a present, developing entity sole and central, by distinguishing between the coming of the Kingdom and the coming of the Son



(1) Emmet in "The Lord of Thought"; MacCulloch, H. R. E. Article "Eschatology".

(2) See Bousset "Kurios Christos", etc.

(3) Mt. 19:28 fails in Lk. Lk. 6:22, 12:8 have no parallels; Mt. omits in Mk. 8:31, and Lk. in his parallel to 10:43.

(4) Mk. 2:12, 28 do not form exceptions. It is equivalent here to "I". The whole point of the narratives lie in making clear the authority of Jesus, not in asserting general truths about man. It is another question whether the words are not more appropriate in the mouth of the early Christian preacher relating the story, than with Jesus himself. He did not need to tell men that he was Lord of the Sabbath. His actions proved it. Since he defends his disciples for their Sabbath laxity, and not himself, it is in fact, a man who has correctly grasped human values, who is lord of the Sabbath.

(5) Mk. 2:10, 28; 9:9 (?); 14:21, 41; passages generally assigned to Q, Mt. 8:20, 11:19, 12:32, 12:40 (?) and parallels; peculiar to Mt. 13:37 (?), 16:13, 26:2; peculiar to Lk. Lk. 6:22, 12:8, 19:10, 22:48. The three passages marked with interrogation point could bear the interpretation that the Son of Man is other than Jesus.

(6) Mk. 8:31, 9:12, 9:31, 10:33, 10:45 with parallels; Lk. 24:7

(7) Mk. 8:38, 13:26, 14:62; Q, Mt. 19:28, 24:27, 37, 39, 44. Peculiar to Mt. 10:23, 13:41, 16:28, 24:36, 25:31; peculiar to Lk. 17:22, 18:8, 21:36.

(8) E. Meyer, "Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums" II., pg. 345 ff. claims an original Persian origin of the term. Whatever its relation to oriental myths of an Urmensch may have been, the important factor lies rather in the connotation which Jesus gave to the name.

(9) Baron von Hügel, "Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion" 1921 pg. 129.



of Man. Only the latter is apocalyptically conceived. (1)  
This is correct in so far as it recognizes the apocalyptic character of that title. We have no right to reject its authenticity in the mouth of Jesus and refer it to "community theology", the common despositary for all to which critics take offence. (2)  
For the evangelists, it is clearly looked upon as a self-designation and is frequently found in one Gospel where the other has the personal pronoun. (3) It is not necessary for our purpose to enter into the difficult problem of the Arimaic usage. In some way the Greek translators could distinguish the Messianic title from the word "man." (4) The uses may be divided into three general groups, where it is equivalent to I, (5) where it is connected with the necessity of suffering (6), and where the reference is to the Parousia (7). All three belong to our oldest sources, but the two latter are the more distinctive.

The phrase without doubt finds its origin within Jewish literature in Daniel 7:13, where it symbolizes the Jewish nation as a fourth Kingdom. (8) It is through no mistake that the evangelists put that quotation in the mouth of Jesus. The word had already become a personal name in the Parables of Enoch (48:3, 6:46:1-2; 49:2), where it is the preexistent Messiah, and recurs again in IV Ezra 13:2, 5,12,25,32. We have no proof however that it had become a common Messianic designation. We are face to face with the deepest truths of the Gospel when Jesus unites this conception of coming glory with present suffering and death. "Only thus on the one hand does the picture in Daniel lose every vestige of gratuitousness or inflation; and only thus on the other hand does the picture in Isaiah not express any ultimate skepticism or pessimism." (9) Individual passages might leave



some doubt as to whether the coming Son of Man were not some other individual ( as Mt.10:23), but it is difficult to ascribe the majority to anyone else than Jesus.

This coming of the Son of Man is furthermore indissolubly connected with the coming of the Kingdom with power. Matthew replaces the latter expression as found in Mark 9:1 with the former. (16:28) We have a series of parables introduced by some such phrase as *ἑτοιμαθήσεται ἡ βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν* which exhort to faithfulness in view of the uncertainty of the time of the Parousia. (Mt. 25:1, Lk. 19:11) These are even more certainly introductory formulae of the evangelist than in the case of the parables of growth. But we believe the "interpretation" contains a partial truth just as in the other case. The Kingdom is not like the virgins, but as they must wait patiently and expectantly for the bridegroom who returns at an unknown hour, so must men wait for the coming of the Kingdom with power at the sudden Parousia of the Son of Man.

(The formulation of this and similar parables which presuppose the delay of the Parousia has undoubtedly been "pointed" to meet community needs. We are not called upon therefore with Wellhausen to deny this parable to Jesus in any form. The kernel is not the delay, but the unexpectedness of the parousia, an idea which certainly belongs to our best tradition. (Mk. 13:33ff.; Lk. 17:24,26; 12:35-40). Wellhausen thinks the parable has arisen from Luke 12:35-6)

The decisive argument however lies not in the examination of individual passages that may be open to doubt as to authenticity, but in the common relation of the Kingdom and the coming of the Son of Man to the judgment. The disciples will long for the Day of the Son of Man because it brings the judgment (Lk 17:22). At that time will come the great division; two shall be in the same bed, or at the same task; one shall be taken and the other left. (Lk 17:34-5) The Kingdom likewise will effect a removal



of the present injustices because it is preceded by the judgment. The only alternative would be to hold on the basis of a single passage (Mk. 10:29-30) that Jesus distinguished a reversal in this age, an intermediate Messianic Kingdom as in Revelation 20:3,7, possibly I Corinthians 15:25-8 and in the later Jewish apocalypses of IV Ezra and II Baruch, from the "coming aeon". There is no clear evidence for the later Rabbinic doctrine of the two aeons however as early as the time of Christ. If the "days of the Messiah" were clearly distinct in the mind of Jesus from "the age to come", we would have a right to expect more evidence than this one verse, when Matthew and Luke agree against Mark in this passage. But even if we should accept Mark 10:29 as authoritative for Jesus, and if one should attempt the impossible task of a systematization, the coming of the Son of Man would precede ἐν τῷ καιρῷ τούτῳ rather than inaugurate the "age to come." We will come back to the relation of the Kingdom to the Judgment. It is sufficient here to indicate that it is not other than that of the coming of the Son of Man.

A second attempt to minimize the apocalyptic element in Jesus is the postulate that we have in Mark 13 and parallels an early Christian apocalypse written about 66 A. D. to encourage the Christians at the opening of the Roman attack. Eusebius mentions such a document. This conjecture is shared also by many scholars who afford the largest measure of acceptance to the place of apocalyptic in Jesus. There is no doubt but that the elaborate description of the cosmic signs, the



(1) If Q is right in making the exception of the "sign of Jonah", it is to be interpreted from Luke as above rather than from Matthew, who clearly does refer to an "outward sign", the resurrection.

(2) Mt. 24:20, 29.



last woes, and the coming of the Son of Man stand in logical contradiction to the eschatological outlook in many words of Jesus. The end will come as suddenly as in the days of Lot and Noah (Lk. 17:26); the servant does not know when his lord will return (Mk. 13:24 ff.); like the flash of lightning that startles everyone will be the coming of the Son of Man in his day. (Lk. 17:24) There would be no outward signs revealing the time of the coming of the Kingdom. (Lk. 17:20) The man who refused to afford legitimization to his work then by a sign from heaven (Mk. 8:12 - Mt. 16:4 Lk. 11:29, Mt. 12:39) (1) expected no warning in the future of the impending judgment except his own call to repentance. The signs were already at hand for those who had eyes to see them. (Lk. 12:56, Mk. 13:28) "The little apocalypse" hypothesis has also much in its favor from an internal study of Mark 13. The disciples inquire for the time of the destruction of the Temple. The reply depicts cosmic catastrophes and the coming of the Son of Man. That two such contradictory words as Mark 13:30 and 13:32 should stand so close together is a mark of composition though not necessarily proof that one or the other is not genuine. Matthew appears to reveal in at least two places that he has access to a more Jewish source than Mark. These arguments are not absolutely convincing and it must be remembered that all apocalyptic material is more or less traditional and that it is the last form of literature from which consistency can be demanded. We have no reason to insist that Jesus had a single, logically-constructed eschatological scheme. That is the product of the author in his study. The vitality of a living hope suffers much inconsistency in detail. But if we do grant the full weight of the arguments showing that the special source in Mark 13 tells us much more of



(1) Holtzman, "N. T. Theologie" I, pg. 285.



the expectations of the Palestinian Christians shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem than of Jesus himself, we may gain consistency for Jesus, but in no way eliminate the apocalyptic element. The "Q" apocalypse as we may roughly term Luke 17:22-37 remains a well-attested and essentially authentic reproduction of the hope of Jesus.

We are now in a position to draw the main results from our summary. We have seen that the immediate nearness of the coming Kingdom, which is common to all apocalyptic, is taken in a new seriousness and earnestness by Jesus. It is not only a Kingdom however of which the immediate coming is sure. The first red rays of its dawning are manifest even now. The word which he scatters abroad meets with varied reception, but its final success is assured for God will bring his own Kingdom to pass. This will be inaugurated by the coming of the Son of Man. Here we come upon the crux of the matter. If the Kingdom was present, it certainly was also future. Is this future consummation however simply the result of a process of evolution and growth over centuries, or is the completion at hand in the speedy re-coming of the Son of Man? Our argument has led us to see that the latter must be the case. "The eschatological perspective of Jesus knows as the last act a powerful act of omnipotence on the part of God, intervening from above and cutting short the whole course of the world; an act whereby human cooperation appeared to be shut out and every bridge between the present and the future broken off." (1) It is difficult to see what possibilities could remain for normal development in the Kingdom after the judgment at the day of the Son of Man. We may say evolution AND catastrophe, but as the catastrophe was near, the



The question of the future of the world is one of the most important and difficult of all. It is a question which has occupied the minds of philosophers, theologians, and statesmen for centuries. The future of the world is a subject which has been discussed in many different ways. Some have believed that the world will continue to exist in its present state, while others have believed that it will be destroyed and recreated. The future of the world is a subject which has been discussed in many different ways. Some have believed that the world will continue to exist in its present state, while others have believed that it will be destroyed and recreated.

(1) "Jüdische Eschatologie". - pages 380-1. The first part of the book is devoted to a discussion of the Jewish view of the future of the world. It is a very interesting and informative study of the Jewish eschatology. The author discusses the Jewish view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner. He discusses the Jewish view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner. He discusses the Jewish view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner.

(2) The second part of the book is devoted to a discussion of the Christian view of the future of the world. It is a very interesting and informative study of the Christian eschatology. The author discusses the Christian view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner. He discusses the Christian view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner. He discusses the Christian view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner.

(3) The third part of the book is devoted to a discussion of the Islamic view of the future of the world. It is a very interesting and informative study of the Islamic eschatology. The author discusses the Islamic view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner. He discusses the Islamic view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner. He discusses the Islamic view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner.

(4) The fourth part of the book is devoted to a discussion of the Hindu view of the future of the world. It is a very interesting and informative study of the Hindu eschatology. The author discusses the Hindu view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner. He discusses the Hindu view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner. He discusses the Hindu view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner.

(5) The fifth part of the book is devoted to a discussion of the Buddhist view of the future of the world. It is a very interesting and informative study of the Buddhist eschatology. The author discusses the Buddhist view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner. He discusses the Buddhist view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner. He discusses the Buddhist view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner.

(6) The sixth part of the book is devoted to a discussion of the Zoroastrian view of the future of the world. It is a very interesting and informative study of the Zoroastrian eschatology. The author discusses the Zoroastrian view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner. He discusses the Zoroastrian view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner. He discusses the Zoroastrian view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner.

(7) The seventh part of the book is devoted to a discussion of the Jain view of the future of the world. It is a very interesting and informative study of the Jain eschatology. The author discusses the Jain view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner. He discusses the Jain view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner. He discusses the Jain view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner.

(8) The eighth part of the book is devoted to a discussion of the Sikh view of the future of the world. It is a very interesting and informative study of the Sikh eschatology. The author discusses the Sikh view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner. He discusses the Sikh view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner. He discusses the Sikh view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner.

(9) The ninth part of the book is devoted to a discussion of the Baha'i view of the future of the world. It is a very interesting and informative study of the Baha'i eschatology. The author discusses the Baha'i view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner. He discusses the Baha'i view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner. He discusses the Baha'i view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner.

(10) The tenth part of the book is devoted to a discussion of the Bahá'í view of the future of the world. It is a very interesting and informative study of the Bahá'í eschatology. The author discusses the Bahá'í view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner. He discusses the Bahá'í view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner. He discusses the Bahá'í view of the future of the world in a very clear and concise manner.



period of evolution was short. Jesus saw with the eyes of faith the beginning of God's rule in his own work. This confidence was sustained by the triumphant hope that the great act of God in history was soon to come.

The question of place is not without its difficulties as well as that of time. Was it to be inaugurated in this world or in another; was it to be "diesseits" or "jenseits." The relevancy of this question to the problems of ethics is apparent. If an "other worldly" Kingdom was at hand, in which entirely different conditions of life were to prevail, the moral instruction might well be more in the nature of a "preparation for the Kingdom rather than of the Kingdom itself." We gain little assistance from comparing the current ideas in Judaism. Volz has collected the relevant material (1) and shown how the earth, Palestine, heaven, an heavenly and earthly Jerusalem, Paradise, - all appear in a gay confusion of conflicting hopes. Once we understand the terminology of Matthew, it is to be realized that his favorite designation does not mean that the place of the Kingdom is in heaven. There are, however, not a few indications that it is jenseits. That is not a difficult conclusion to draw from the frequent expression "enter into the Kingdom" (2). It is equivalent then to heaven. In the parable of the Judgment, the elect are addressed, "Come ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world". (Mt. 25:34) As the contrast is with the eternal fire, the Kingdom would appear to be "other-worldly".

(As it stands, Matthew 25:31-46 is a description and not a parable. The Jewish character of the whole is undeniable. Wellhausen and others contend that we have a product of the early Christian community elaborating Luke 13: 26-7. "In my name" counts for as little as in the parable of the Good Samaritan (Lk. 10:29-37). J. Weiss thinks that



(1) ἐν τῇ παλιγγερεσίᾳ Mt. 19:28. Also  
καὶνῶν in Mk. 14:25

(2) The fluctuating position of this verse in the manuscripts has given rise to the frequent conjecture that it is an interpolation. Its omission would leave just 7 (holy number) beatitudes in the third person. It is also not in the Lucan version. There is no sufficient reason to doubt however that Jesus might not have re-affirmed this Old Testament promise. At any rate its interpretation is correct as to the place of the Kingdom. ἡ γῆ should probably be translated "land" instead of earth.

(As it stands, Matthew 25:31-46 is a parable and not a parable. The Jewish character of the whole is undeniable. Wellhausen and others contend that we have a good deal of the early Christian community's interpretation of the parable. In my opinion, however, the parable is a parable of the Good Samaritan (Lk. 10:30-37). I believe that the



a parable underlies the description of a King who punishes and rewards according as people have treated his subjects. He denies however that the Christians are excluded from the Judgment here. Zahn (also K. Lake) contends on the other hand that verse 40, "inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these my brethren...." refers to the Christians who are not judged. The whole scene is not necessarily to be rejected because the Son of Man appears as judge. (See Mt. 16:27 vs. 10:32) If there are difficulties in attributing the whole of the passage to Jesus himself, yet the thought of judgment recurs frequently in the Gospels.

Similarly in the parable of Lazarus and Dives there appears to be no place for an earthly Kingdom. Between Lazarus in Abraham's bosom and the rich man in Hades there is a great gulf fixed (Lk. 16:26). Both destinations appear final. The reward promised the persecuted disciples is in heaven (Mt. 5:12); men should lay up treasures "in heaven", not on earth (Mt. 6:20). In the resurrection from the dead men neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as angels in heaven. (Mk. 12:35) Hence the conditions of the promised aeon are at least as those in heaven.

In contrast to these hints, stand some clear indications that the earth, possibly under new conditions (1), but still the earth, will be the seat of the Kingdom. The explanatory clause to the petition in the Lord's Prayer, "Thy Kingdom come", says definitely, "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." (Mt. 6:10) The coming of the Kingdom is synonymous with the perfect realization of God's will on earth. The promises in the beatitudes are all paraphrases of the first and last, "For theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven." (Mt. 5:3 - Lk. 6:20, Mt. 5:10). One of these reads, "Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth." (Mt. 5:6)

(2) The parables of growth all indicate that the earth, the seat of Jesus's activity will be the place of the new Kingdom when it comes with power. The reception of the idea of catastrophe does not alter the place of the Kingdom. The Son of Man will come on



earth. (Mt. 24:27- Lk.17:24; Mt. 24:37- Lk. 17:26; Mk. 14:62 and parallels, etc.) It is Paul first who speaks of the elect as "caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air." (1. Thes. 4:17) The Kingdom is rather symbolized by the very earthly figure of a banquet at which they drink of the fruit of the vine in company with Abraham, Issac, and Jacob. (Mk. 14:25; Lk. 8:11; 14:15, etc. )

He who would seek to harmonize all these expressions attempts the impossible task of compressing poetry within logical formulas. Of two things we can be certain however, the place is to be the earth, not heaven, but the conditions of life will be radically changed. If the driving out of demons and healing of the sick and raising the dead are signs of its coming, the Kingdom must be without sickness or death. Hence, the present relations of family and sex will not abide. (Mk. 12:35) The hungry will be fed, the sorrowful will be comforted. When justice rules, the humanitarian service of the present will no longer be needed. The mark of the Kingdom is righteousness (Mt. 6:33), its coming will mean its perfect realization. But morality in no way exhausts the idea of the Kingdom. It is God's Kingdom and then shall the ideal that was hitherto unreachable even for Moses be attained; "The pure in heart shall see God." (Mt. 5:8)

With this orientation into the main features of Jesus's prophecy of the Kingdom we are in a position to enter upon a closer examination of his individual moral teachings. We must see first in what particulars the essentially (but by no means exclusively) apocalyptic conception of the Kingdom moulded his ethical teaching. We must then give full justice to the sections which bear no mark of influence by the immediacy of these hopes before we will be in a position to evaluate the effect of apocalyptic eschatology upon the ethics of Jesus.



Chapter IV.

EVIDENCE OF INFLUENCE FROM APOCALYPTIC  
ESCHATOLOGY ON THE ETHICS OF JESUS.



"Repent, for the Kingdom of God is at hand." Those ringing words were borne on the wave of a motivation not short of the eternal. The expected Kingdom would not come as a heritage simply to those belonging to Israel. Jesus did not stand behind the Old Testament prophets in asserting the ethical demand for repentance, but sharpened this through his keen criticism of the piety of his contemporaries, and his far-reaching interpretation of the consequences of the will of God. He likened his work unto that of Jonah calling the Ninevites to repentance (Mt. 12:39-Lk. 11:29). They repented in sackcloth and ashes, but behold "more than Jonah is here". No other sign would be given. (Lk. 16:30) The motivation to repentance lay not in outward wonders, but in the reign of God that was about to be ushered in, wherein only the repentant could find place. The reverse aspect of this promise was the judgment that accompanied the coming of the Kingdom. The nearness of God's rule was not alone a cause for rejoicing but a reason for fear. (Mt. 10:28-Lk. 12:5) Men must strive to enter in by the narrow gate, for there was a broad way that led unto destruction. (Mt. 7:13-4-Lk. 13:23-4) True, the fear of God that casts out all other fear should give confidence to the repentant heart in the Heavenly Father who cares even for the sparrows. But the Galilean cities who turned a deaf ear to God's messenger should fare worse in the day of judgment than the wicked Gentile cities, for in their streets had occurred no such wonderful demonstrations of divine power. (Mt. 11:20 ff.- Lk. 10:13-15) Like a two-edged sword came the impelling message of the coming King-



dom. The Galileans who had fallen under Pilate, and the 18 inhabitants of Jerusalem upon whom the Tower of Siloam had fallen were not greater sinners than others. Like a fig tree which had borne no fruit were the smug Pharisees beholding these disasters in a false sense of security. (Lk. 13:1-9) They were vainly imagining that they had no need for repentance. God accepts rather the man who prays with sincerity "God be merciful unto me a sinner". (Lk. 16:30) As for the religious stage-actors who could not read the signs of the on-coming Kingdom and the Judgment, "Except ye repent, ye shall all in like manner perish." (Lk. 13:2)

( C. W. Emmett in advancing his thesis that Jesus was the "Lord of Thought", in his book with Miss Dougall bearing that title has emphasized the inconsistency between the Fatherhood of God and the Judgment as implied above. He attempts to show that the latter must be an "accretion". To what limits he is driven we see on page 262 where he interprets Mt. 4:17 as meaning, "Repent and the Kingdom will come." Such well-intentioned modernization only illustrates the difficulty in combining historical interpretation with practical application. The universalism popular in many modern Christian circles is read back into Jesus's conception of the Fatherhood of God. We need to ponder on the old words of Lactantius however, "A God who cannot be angry, also cannot love.")

Most moralists, accepting the insight vigorously championed by Kant, that any thought of reward or punishment is debasing to the good will, which is the necessary and sole criterion of the good, will criticize this motivation of Jesus as eudaemonistic. We must at the outset reject the idea of forcibly harmonizing the ethical teaching of Jesus with any system, that of Kant or any other. The moral authority of Jesus is diminished, not increased, by such violence. If modern thinkers have corrected the moral insight of Jesus, the fact must be honestly recognized. It lies outside the scope of this thesis



(1) A recent example is Max Scheler, "Der Formalismus in der Ethik und die materiale Wertethik". 1921. More directly bearing on our question is the treatise, "Grundprobleme der Ethik" by Ernst Troeltsch in the second volume of his collected writings, 1913.

(2) Particularly is this to be received in Mt. 6:4,6,18, and other passages peculiar to the Judaistic evangelist. It must be granted however that this criticism is too subjective to be pressed.



to discuss at length the various types of ethical theory. We can only point out in passing that the place of the objective moral ideal is being more and more recognized and emphasized in our day. (1)

We must not overlook the place that rewards held in popular Jewish morality during the whole period of Judaism. It is not unlikely therefore that this has colored the tradition at some points. (2) We cannot forget that Jesus was a preacher to the masses rather than a philosophic moralist. Preachers have at all times used the language of rewards and punishments to bring home their conviction of the moral order of the universe, although it was far from their intention to ground the authority of the good in these outward circumstances. But we can never fully understand the place of rewards in the message of Jesus until we realize its connection with the approaching Kingdom of God. There was one reward, participation in this Kingdom, (Mt. 16:27). What language should one use for the unrepentant than that of punishments? "Great is your reward in heaven" (Mt. 5:12) does not refer to a future recompense that is to take place in heaven. Rather, the Kingdom which is about to come on earth exists already in heaven. The rewards are not "jenseits" as in the later Christian theology; the Kingdom is the reward.

(Luke 6:32-5 seems to be contradictory. A reward is excluded for doing good to those who love us. On the other hand, a great reward awaits those whose good will extends even to their enemies. This is to be resolved by noting the distinction between pay for individual acts, and the participation in God's Kingdom, which is the great reward for those whose good will is genuine enough to lead to love of enemies. Matthew 6:4,6, 18 correlate the innerness of rewards with the necessity for inward motivation in all outward forms of piety. The rewards however must be interpreted in connection with the other words in the tradition.)



(1) This is not contradicted by the exhortation to seek the Kingdom and his righteousness rather than to be anxious concerning the cares of this world. (Mt. 6:33) We cannot share the view of J. Weiss that righteousness here means simply acquittal in the judgment. The thought is rather parallel to 5:6, that hungering and thirsting after righteousness is a qualification of the citizens of the coming Kingdom.



The rewards which Jesus promised cannot be made the object of striving. (1) The judgment scene in Matthew 25 has been aptly termed not the judgment, but a judgment. Its Jewish coloring is undeniable, but the distinctive feature is that the rewards come totally unexpected. The people who revealed the works of love that are given as the ground for their reward had no realization that they had earned anything <sup>or</sup> had they been working for a recompense. We cannot strive for rewards, furthermore, because we have no claim on God. In the last analysis all is grace. As the slave can expect no thank even for carrying out all his Lord's commands, "Even so ye also, when ye shall have done all the things that are commanded you, say, "We are unprofitable servants; we have done that which it was our duty to do." (Lk. 17:10) - God gives, he does not pay as an ordinary task master according to the measure of our endeavor. (Mt. 20:1-16) That cuts the nerve from the immorality of rewards. Grace and rewards were never more nobly united than in the comforting words, "Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the Kingdom." (Lk. 12:32)

(The connection of this verse, which we hold against Bultman and others to be genuine although only found in Luke, is very instructive. The evangelist places it directly after the word on "seeking the Kingdom." This brings out clearly the complementary aspects of the ethical preparedness through repentance and the fact that no righteousness can earn the Kingdom. Luke then follows with warnings against laying up treasure on earth. In contrast to Matthew, he has formed the logion so that the treasure in heaven is merit from alms-giving, which he everywhere values highly. Matthew leaves it undefined beyond its indestructible character. Bultman has laid it against the genuineness of this logion that the eschatological element is lacking. The man, however, who is rich unto God (Lk. 12:21) is the one for whom the coming Kingdom is fixed. Is not this the treasure in heaven also? Interpreted thus, it cannot be conceived literally as "stored up" by men.)



(1) Grimm. "Die Ethik Jesu". pg. 169 ff.



The distinction between recompense and rejection has much to recommend it. (1) The former never escapes completely from an element of revenge. Rejection simply asserts the ethical qualifications for participation in the coming Kingdom, the maintenance of human freedom, the denial of universalism, and also a certain religious predestination which must be distinguished from any theological theory. Good trees bring forth good fruit and evil trees evil fruit. (Mt. 7:18 ff. Lk. 6:43 ff.) So in life all depends on the inner nature and character of the man. (Mt. 12:34-5) At this point Jesus stops; the way of speculation he does not follow. The evil fruit is cast into the fire; the Kingdom will be a time of rejection. (Mt. 7:21 ff., Lk. 13:26 ff. and especially the parables of judgment as Mk. 12:1-12, Mt. 25:1-10, Lk. 14:15, etc.)

We have seen that the call to repentance is sharpened and intensified by the conviction that the reign of God was at hand. We must follow this through in the individual exhortations. One of the sins especially singled out by Jesus for condemnation was insincerity. The great arraignment of the hypocrites of his time is to be found in woes against the Pharisees in Matthew 23:1-36 and Luke 11:42-52. The woe is the prophetic form of the eschatological threat. The arrangement into seven is certainly due to the evangelist but the form of exhortation is genuine. The woes end with the assurance, "Verily I say unto you, all these things shall come upon this generation." (Mt. 23:36)

The warning against the danger of riches also occupied a prominent place in his summons to repentance. Many of the words on wealth have no eschatological bearing, for the



(1) This parable has certainly suffered wide redaction. Verses 27-31 are quite distinct. The center of interest are the five brothers (Pharisees) who have not believed Moses and the prophets, nor will they believe if one rises from the dead, an event which is already in the past for Luke's source. There is nothing about riches in this supplement.



danger of riches lay not merely in the immediacy of the Kingdom but that the service of Mammon at all times and under all conditions made it impossible to be a slave unto God. (Mt. 6:24, Lk. 16:13) If our treasure is found in temporal and corruptible things our life will pass with them. We must set our heart on a treasure that is incorruptible. (Mt. 6:19-Lk. 12:33) Not only are riches treacherous because they pass away, but in the hour of his greatest apparent security man may be torn from them. (Lk. 13:13-21) In the parable of the rich man and Lazarus we have a vivid picture of the economic contrasts of this world being reversed in the age to come. The customary Jewish dogma that riches were a sign of God's favor is reversed; rather those who have enjoyed the goods of life have less ground for expectation beyond. (1) The eschatology of this parable must be probably assigned to the evangelist for nowhere else in the Gospels are the poor carried away to heaven. Jesus's own eschatological outlook is better preserved in the similar Lukan woe (6:24), the formulation of which however must be assigned to the author of the third Gospel whose sociological ideas are not quite the same as his Master. The great turning will be a time of tribulation for the rich. That was the conviction of Jesus at least, even if the ground be not simply because "ye have received your consolation." Modern apologetes have pointed out not without reason that Jesus continuously had friendly intercourse with publicans, prosperous fishermen, and people whose situation enabled them to entertain hospitably if not lavishly. Allowance must of course be made for the hyperbole and exaggeration used to awaken lethargic souls reposing their confidence



in the "parable". The fact remains that in the mind of Jesus, it is easier for a camel to go through the needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God. (Mt. 19:24 and parallels) Here we have the clear orientation with the thought of the Kingdom which we have seen to be essentially the setting of God's rule in the immediate future. The newness which precedes (in the Gospel, though such words were hardly confined to one incident. Some particular attention is to be paid, however, to the freedom from obligations with the world which were necessary for those following in the circle of Jesus. The newness of the Kingdom is seen in the fact that Jesus is not only a teacher but a savior. The danger of misunderstanding is to be avoided in relation to the Kingdom. This brings us to the question of the Kingdom and the newness of the Kingdom. The Kingdom is not a political entity, but a spiritual one. It is the Kingdom of God, and it is the Kingdom of the future. The Kingdom is not a geographical area, but a spiritual one. It is the Kingdom of God, and it is the Kingdom of the future. The Kingdom is not a political entity, but a spiritual one. It is the Kingdom of God, and it is the Kingdom of the future. The Kingdom is not a geographical area, but a spiritual one. It is the Kingdom of God, and it is the Kingdom of the future.

"(1) The connection with the preceding incident is not necessarily organic. Jesus corrects Peter's limited willingness to forgive (7 times) with a readiness that sets no boundary (70 times 7). The parable however says nothing of the number of times one should forgive. Rather, God's unbounded grace is contrasted with the unforgiving attitude of man toward his fellow."



in the "exception". The fact remains that in the mind of Jesus, "It is easier for a camel to go through the needle's eye, than for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God. (Mk. 10:25 and parallels) Here we have the clear orientation with the thought of the Kingdom which we have seen to be essentially the setting up of God's rule in the immediate future. The conversation which precedes (in the Gospel, though such words were hardly confined to one incident. Some particular occasion is to be postulated however) concerns the freeing from entanglements with the world which were necessary for those following in the immediate circle of Jesus and sharing in his mission. But with verse 23 Jesus has gone over to general considerations. The danger of riches lay primarily in relation to the coming Kingdom. This brings into clearer relief the less definite eschatological hints noted above. Wealth was no qualification for citizenship. On the other hand, it took our affection from God and chained our hearts to the order that is soon to pass.

The third sin singled out for special condemnation by Jesus was the unforgiving spirit. This is always related to God's forgiveness in the Judgment, and as we have frequently noted, the Judgment is bound up with the coming of the Kingdom. Be reconciled with your brother at once for at the Judgment it will be too late. (Lk. 12:57-9, Mt. 5:25-6) There is but one petition in the Lord's Prayer with an apparent condition attached. We have no right to pray to God for forgiveness as long as we do not forgive our fellow men. (Mt. 6:12,14; Lk. 11:4,25) This thought is illustrated in one of the finest parables of grace. (Mt. 18:23-5) (1) The temporal sequence must be entirely overlooked in the interpretation of the parable. Jesus



does not mean to indicate that God's forgiveness, once fully given, is then retracted. That is an unwarranted allegorization of the parable. The man who has not forgiven his fellow men has not truly made that repentance which is the condition on man's side of citizenship in the Kingdom and cannot therefore receive God's full forgiveness.

We have thus seen under the chief sins that Jesus attacked how the expectation of the coming Kingdom sharpened the motivation to repentance. For individual passages cited, the apocalyptic conditioning may be of course contested. It would be absurd to contend that except for his belief in the coming Kingdom, Jesus would not have attacked hypocrisy, the trust in riches, the unforgiving spirit, etc. The demand for repentance was not alone grounded in eschatology, but therein lay the tremendous urgency, the added force, the sharpness of the warning and the buoyancy of the hope. Popular preaching has never failed to support its ethical insight by some form of eschatology, if not an appeal to rewards and punishments beyond, then a reference to the values of moral conduct in this life, or on the most glorified plane, the inner satisfaction of duty accomplished and good attained. The belief in a coming social order erected by God in which his will shall be perfectly done on earth is but a particular form of eschatological motivation.

We tread upon other ground however when we consider another group of sayings from the tradition. They have been usually treated with the general words on family, wealth, etc. in the practical endeavor to present Jesus's attitude on these life questions. This disposition utterly overlooks the his-



torical origin of the words in the endeavor to win a systematic view that can honestly claim for itself the authority of Jesus. These sayings have been the refuge of those assigning the enmity of Jesus toward much that is popular in modern civilization to the dreams of an apocalyptic fanatic. They have been the despair of those seeking to assure us that the ethics of the Gospel are not after all so different from the accepted standards of our day.

The confusion lies in the ambiguity of the word "follow". For us and even for the Christian who first preserved the oral tradition of the words of Jesus, "to follow" him was fraught with the figurative meaning of believing on him as Messiah and Lord, and accepting his spiritual leadership in life. To the first hearers in Galilee however it had another and more particular meaning. For the work of proclaiming the Kingdom Jesus needed helpers. Within the multitude who heard him gladly were smaller circles who were under the more immediate working of his personality, whom he called "to be with him", who could be brought to understand, as was impossible with the masses, "the secrets of the Kingdom", the real nature of his own idea of what God's rule among men must mean. This circle was probably formed quite gradually. The earlier tours among the synagogues of Galilee may not have been accompanied by "the disciples". (Mk. 1:39) But at some time in his ministry Jesus chose 12 of these who had been closer to him, to follow in the most literal sense of the word.

(That Judas was always spoken of as "one of the twelve" excludes in our judgment the hypothesis that the "Apostolic College" is a creation of the early community rather than of Jesus. There is no reason why the symbolism of the number should not have appealed to him as well as his followers. The later unimportance of most of the Twelve speaks for



(1) It does not appeal to us as a sound literary criterion for source criticism in Mark to distinguish a "disciple" source from one which knows the institution of the "twelve." (See E. Meyer, U. und A. des Chris. I pg. 133 ff.) The evangelist is not concerned with maintaining absolute consistency of terminology. In the same story he changes from one to the other. (Mk. 14:12,17) The twelve were all disciples though all the disciples were not of the "twelve." Hence the confusion. The possibility cannot be excluded of course that some of the literary material Mark had before him (if we are induced to posit such) made no mention of a fixed number.

(2) The impression of aimless wandering hither and thither which one gains from the Gospels is of course enhanced by the fragmentary nature of the tradition. Detached incidents are related to each other by "journeys". But that Jesus' life was no settled one is clear from such words as Luke 9:58 and Matthew 8:20.

(3) Matthew 19:21 however in contrast to the more original Markan account supports the later Catholic doctrine of "counsels of perfection" over and above our moral duty.



their historicity.)

Within the twelve was a group who enjoyed a special intimacy with their master, (Mk. 5:37, 9:2, 13:3, 14:33) and beyond was a wider group terms simply "disciples" among whom were included some women. (Lk. 8:2) (1) As Jesus retired from Galilee to the north it was a physical impossibility for many to follow him in his wanderings, but this summons did come to some. (2)

For his immediate followers there must be a severing of family ties in many cases. It was certainly true in his own. When his religious enthusiasm was interpreted as madness in his own home circle (Mk. 3:21), Jesus proclaims the doers of the will of God as his true relatives (Mk. 3:35). Some will remain celibate for the sake of the Kingdom, among whom he certainly had himself in mind. There was an immediate religious urgency demanding workers who were freed from the ordinary relationships of life. That does not mean a low evaluation of family life or marriage. Other utterances make that clear. Jesus is demanding no "higher morality" of these immediate followers. (3) It is with full realization that genuine goods of life must be subordinated that Jesus issues the harsh and hyperbolic summons, "If any man cometh unto me and hateth not his own father and mother and wife and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." (Lk. 14:26) Discipleship here and in similar cases is used in the narrower sense of joining the immediate followers of Jesus. Peter, speaking for all the disciples says, "We have left all and followed thee." (Mk. 10:28) The reply of Jesus concerns the severing of family ties much more than wealth. We know that Peter

<sup>I</sup>  
was married (I Cor. 9:5) but it is an improbable assumption



(1) Mark preserves the most original account of the instructions. The permission of a staff and sandals shows the object of Jesus was not to encourage asceticism, but to insure the greatest efficiency on a pedestrian tour by lightening the equipment to the sacrifice of comfort if need be.



that his wife was among the "women" mentioned by Luke, Special sacrifices were demanded of some in the interest of the immediate work, and under the pressure of the expectancy of the hour.

The same was true of financial sacrifices and the necessity for freedom from worldly concerns. It is probably impossible to distinguish in detail the instructions given the Twelve for their Galilean mission during the life-time of Jesus from the instruction of the earliest Palestinian missionaries. The transmitters of the tradition, those earliest preachers, would not likely themselves clearly distinguish between the travel prescriptions of the historical Jesus, and the guidance of the risen Lord. One thing is clear however from Mark 6:7-13, Matthew 9:35, 10:16, Luke 9:1-6 and 10:1-15, that the utmost simplicity of life was to be maintained.(1) There must be no ties that would draw one to look back. It is against the background of these missionary instructions that we must understand the incident of the zealous seeker after eternal life,(Mk. 10:17 ff.) a not inaccurate equivalent of the Kingdom. It is evident from the reply of the seeker that he desires to do something more than fulfill the moral requirements of repentance. His judgment concerning his life may have been very superficial (Mk.10:20) but at least he possessed moral enthusiasm. One further demand Jesus can make of him, to join his immediate circle of followers in their work, - "to follow me"; but in preparation he must sell his earthly possessions. That was too hard a demand, and the seeker went away sadly - back to his possessions. This incident illustrates clearly the fact that Jesus did not require the selling of property from all, but did make special demands



of his immediate followers, just as for himself, "for the sake of the Kingdom," and, as his own life was so indissolubly connected with it, "for my sake."

A further special demand laid upon the immediate disciples was the necessity of enduring persecution. It was part of the fixed Messianic dogma, especially crystalized from the time of the oppression under Antiochus Epiphanes and the hardships of the Maccabean wars, that the birth hours of the Messianic era should be accompanied by a persecution of the saints. But it was not a matter of theoretical dogma with Jesus. The disputes with the Pharisees over the conduct of Jesus and his disciples and over the interpretation of the law always ended by only increasing the hostility of the party leaders (Mk. 3:6, 11:18, 12:12,). We have no reason to doubt that Jesus avoided Galilee in the latter part of his ministry because of the opposition from the side of Herod. (Lk. 13:33) It is not so clear when and how the priestly party in Jerusalem first came into direct hostility to Jesus. The Passion narrative however makes it clear that the evangelists consider them chiefly responsible for his death. We cannot follow Schweitzer in the interpretation that Jesus directly courted death in pursuance of his Messianic dogma. The necessity was primarily historical, not dogmatic. The persecution was personal, but for the sake of the Kingdom. Hence all those who "followed" Jesus must be ready to share in it. It is not accidental that Mark connects the first words concerning suffering for the disciples with the first expressed realization of the Twelve that Jesus is to be the anointed in the coming Kingdom. (Mk. 8:34, 9:1) They must deny themselves, be willing to lose their lives if necessary, fear-



(1) *παρουσία* should be rendered "coming", and not return or second coming. Jesus was the Messiah, but he would first exercise his Messianic functions at the parousia.



lessly confess him and his cause, else they would have no part in the Kingdom "when the Son of man cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels." (Mk. 8:38)

(In the life time of Jesus the disciples experienced no serious persecution or suffering. But the early Palestinian communities were subject to severe attacks. (Acts 4:3,20; 5:17, 8:1, 9:1, 31; 12:1.) It is not strange therefore that most of the words attributed to Jesus bear the mark of the experiences of the early Church. Especially is this the case with Matthew 10:17-25, Mark 13:9:13, Luke 21:12-17, 12:11,12. The same suspicion may well be attached to the word cited above and Matthew 10:32. But even if there be none which do not bear the imprint of the early Church in their formulation, we have no reason to deny a kernel to Jesus,- the fact that he expected his closest disciples to bear persecution for the sake of the Kingdom, growing out of the extraordinary nature of the time.)

There were those present who would behold it in their generation. (Mk. 9:1) <sup>(1)</sup> The last of the beatitudes pronounces a blessing on those who were persecuted "for righteousness' sake", who were hated and despised, and cast out for the sake of the Son of Man. That is a mark that they belong to the coming Kingdom. (Mt. 5:10-2, Lk. 6:22-3) These words would lose their point if spoken to the mass of believing hearers. It was true for Jesus's immediate circle in their Messianic expectation, and it soon became true for the Palestinian communities after the death of Jesus, when they possessed a distinct separateness which was not true at the time of his own Galilean ministry.

Closely allied are the exhortations to faithfulness which occupy such an important place in the last part of the work of Jesus. ~~For the most part they stress~~ the necessity of preparedness for the coming of the Messiah. As suddenly as in the days of Noah or of Lot shall the Son of Man come in judgment.



Blessed is that servant who is faithful and found ready. This is the theme of a group of parables that are rendered difficult of interpretation by allegorizing and adaptation at the hand of the community.

(It appears to us an impossibility to reconstruct with absolute certainty the literary relation of these one to another, or the relation within the tradition, or to decide the question of priority. Julicher is probably correct that Mark 13:33-7 is a secondary compilation of the evangelist in which he reveals knowledge of the parable of the virgins in the exhortation to watch and not be found sleeping, of the parable of the talents in giving authority to servants, and of the lord returning late from a feast (Lk. 12:35-8). The exhortation to watch applies to all (Mk. 13:37). This is the meaning also of the allegory in Luke 12:42-6). ~~Only~~ Only in the application is the faithful servant so gloriously rewarded. The "all" here however is better understood of the whole early Church in contrast to merely its leaders, rather than any division between the disciples and a wider circle. Luke 21:34-6 is probably a late summary.)

The time of waiting is to be spent in the faithful and diligent service of their Lord. (Lk. 19:11-27, Mt. 25:14-30).

(Luke has combined the parable with another of a King going to receive a kingdom. (See Jos. Ant. XII, 162) or else has changed the original. If the possibility that both forms are original is not absolutely to be excluded, all artificial explanations which would give them a different meaning are certainly to be rejected. (See Bruce, "Parabolic Teaching of Jesus" for example). Faithful work is commended, but the crux lies in the return of the Lord.)

We are inclined to attribute the "motif" of the long delay of the return to the community which speaks from its own experience.

(Mt. 25:5, Mk. 13:35, Lk. 12:45) Furthermore, the exhortations to "watch", and "let your loins be girded about, and your lamps burning" already have metaphorical significance. But the most radical criticism can hardly gainsay that the immediate coming of the Kingdom furnishes the background for the gospel exhortations to faithfulness. Like a thief in the night will he come (Lk. 12:39); hence, be faithful and ready. If we did



not realize the historical conditioning of these words, we might suppose that Jesus grounded faithfulness to duty in general in promised rewards, a not very lofty teaching to say the least. Once grasp that the certainty of the coming Kingdom is primary, and we will judge very differently.

So far we have considered rather the darker aspect of the apocalyptic message. We have sought to show that the proclamation of the Kingdom brought not merely "Good News", but announcement of Judgment, call to sacrifice, endurance, and hardship. Nevertheless, it was "good news," a true gospel, that the time of God's salvation was at hand. The most distinctive note in Jesus is one of joy. His call was to repentance; his assurance that "there is joy in the presence of God over one sinner that repenteth." (Lk. 15:10) The difference between John the Baptist and Jesus lay in that the latter felt that presence of the Kingdom was already manifesting itself. (Mt. 11:2 ff) Hence it is not a time for fasting and sorrow, but for feasting and joy. (Mk. 2:19) His own radiant joy gave offence unto men as much as the austerities of John. (Mt. 11:19) We must not overlook that the ground for this joy lay in his inward fellowship with God. Neither can we confine it to this. He cannot refrain from reminding his disciples that their eyes are beholding wonders that prophets and kings of old waited in vain to see. (Lk. 10:23-4, Mt. 13:16-7) Therefore rejoice, not merely at the downfall of the demons on earth, but in what awaits them from heaven. (Lk. 10:20)

¶We see no sufficient ground to ascribe this word with Bultman ( op. cit. pg. 67) to the risen Lord. Nor does it appear arbitrary to interpret the last clause as joy over participation in the Kingdom. Bultman is at least right in linking this word with Luke 12:32. They stand or fall together.)



The positive moral teaching of Jesus is usually expressed in his own summary of the Law and the Prophets, love to God and love of neighbor as self. This is certainly more nearly correct than the interpretation which stresses the positive wording of the Golden Rule. Even in this form it does not completely overcome utilitarianism. And it may well be insisted that genuine love can know no eschatological conditioning. The duty of him who would really help his neighbor is clear whether the time be long or short, whether righteousness guides the hand of the universe or not. (Lk. 10:29-37) Again we are concerned not with the absolute foundation but the historical conditioning.

We arrive here at the point where critics of the teaching of Jesus raise with largest justification the claim of impracticability and where apologists practice the most nimble-side-stepping to avoid the clear implication of the text. They present as Loisy well says, "a perpetual challenge to all human experience," and he who measures all possibilities by the past can surely make little of them. Boundless love is awakened not abstractly, but in relation to particular conditions that seem to warrant and demand it. The limits of love we believe were influenced by the apocalyptic expectation, which again, we cannot often enough emphasize, is to say nothing concerning their permanent validity.

There were two main forms of Messianic hope in Judah at the time of Christ. One was more political, the other transcendental. The one hoped to establish the rule of God under Israel by forcibly overthrowing the oppressing power, which was now Rome. The other expected a wonderful act of God himself, for human might could never bring the righteousness of the Kingdom of Heaven. The former was represented by such men as Judas and Theudas and



(1) Acts 5:36-7.

(2) This is only the more striking as the title is occasionally found on the lips of those addressing Jesus. Mk. 10:47-8, Mk. 11:10 and parallels; also Mt. 9:27, 12:23, 15:22, 21:15.

(3) In Hebrew, etc.



the later zealots (1); to the latter belonged the "still im Lande" and it was in their circles that the apocalyptic literature arose and was cherished. Nothing is clearer than the fact that Jesus rejected political Messianism. His avoidance of such titles as "Son of David" (2), his refusal to challenge the political authority of Caesar (Mk. 12:13-17 and par.), and the whole religious focus of his message prove that conclusively. Every attempt to explain early Christianity as a revolutionary proletarian movement is doomed in advance to failure. Jesus opposed revolutionary uprising because the foe was not Rome, but Beelzebul and the sinful demons of this age. God's rule was not to come thus.

But many were aroused to passions and deeds of violence when the Kingdom expectation was awakened within them. Jesus was compelled to face not merely the external superficiality of the pious Pharisees and the fickle indifference of the masses, and the unheroic contentedness of the rich. He had to check the misguided enthusiasm of those who would storm the Kingdom by force. If they were not to bring in the Kingdom by force, the clear-cut alternative was non-resistance to evil. Jesus expresses this in the most paradoxically extreme statements. When impressed service is demanded, go even farther in fulfilling the will of the oppressor; when a man goes to law to take thy coat, give him your cloak also without contesting the suit; instead of returning physical violence, patiently turn even the other cheek. (Mt. 5:39-41 Lk. 6:29-30) ~~These are not the words of a man~~

(The scheme of six antitheses in the Sermon on the Mount may go back to Q even though the only two Luke retains do not have that introduction. Such a discussion of the Jewish law was not of primal importance for his readers. Yet Albertz may be right in holding that 1, 2, and 4 belong to a



separate source. At least we may be sure that the antithetical form is not original for the section on non-resistance; for it is believed that at the time of Christ the ius talionis was in practice replaced by a fine; and this illustration (as also 3 and 6) unlike the other three abolish the Mosaic law; quoted rather than expands it to its farthest implications. (Albertz, op. cit. pg. 145 ff.) The other three actually "fulfill" the law; this antithesis would destroy the law. Its real superscription is verse 20 and not 17, and is the righteousness that must exceed that of the scribes and Pharisees that is required of those who would "enter into the Kingdom of Heaven.")

These are not the words of a man proposing changes in the law of the land. Here speaks he who said, "Blessed are ye when men shall.. persecute you." Such harsh and difficult words would turn back every yearner for a Messianic war of deliverance. The Kingdom was <sup>not</sup> to come ~~not~~ by force. Thus spake the man who proclaimed it for the near future in such confidence that he could challenge men to the most far-reaching non-resistance in order to avoid an appeal to force.

The deepest expression of love that Jesus can recommend is love to enemies. Until it has reached this plane it has not completely cast off the scales of reciprocity, of business cleverness, or the fraternity that is cherished even among men of ill will. If a man replies that it is impossible to command love, the Lukan version shows at least that we can do good unto them. The *προσδοκῶν* in Matthew and *χαρίτις* in Luke make clear that the words are spoken under the expectation of a time of reward for those who do reveal themselves as sons of the Most High in their impartial mercy.

(Which is the more original, Matthew 5:48 or Luke 6:36?)

While the idea of ethical perfection is more Platonic and Stoic than Jewish, it is not entirely foreign to the Old Testament. (Dt. 18:13, II Sam. 22:26, etc.) The meaning is complete self-giving to God in contrast to half-hearted feigning rather than perfection of character. It would be very appealing to take the words as a promise referring to the time of the Kingdom, but we must not be led to allow



(1) Luke 22:44 ff. makes clear that Mark 10:41-5 should be separated from the incident of the sons of Zebedee preceding. Verses 35-40 concern the chief seats in the age to come; 41-5, ideals of lordship or of service.

(2) In the parable of the two unlike sons and of the guests who refuse the feast, Jesus is thinking of relations within Israel. If Matthew 21:31b be an addition of the evangelist (Jülicher) the parable has no connection here, but is simply an illustration of Mt. 7:21. The "bad and good" in Mt. 22:10 are the publicans and sinners. Luke's version containing the double sending has a reference to the heathen mission which is not original. In the allegory of the vineyard (and it is an arbitrary assumption that Jesus never utilized allegory) the vineyard is given to "others" without closer designation as to whether the heathen are meant or not.



wishes to guide us in exegesis. If we could be sure that Luke's arrangement were original with the transition to condemnation of judgment, that would be decisive in his favor. We can but leave the question non liquet.)

This love will express itself in refusing to act as judge over our fellow men.

(Klosterman has given it a happy phrasing in the German, "Nicht richten aber nicht urtheillos". Genuine love to our friends will lead us to critical judgment, in their own interest. This word of Jesus must likewise be interpreted in the light of his own example, and the Pharisees may have thought that Jesus was not always consistent in this regard.)

How can we expect mercy in God's final judgment which is so near at hand, if we, who ourselves <sup>are</sup> sinful, practice condemnation? (Mt. 7:1, Lk. 6:37) Only a boundless love accords with the promise of the Kingdom.

Another aspect of this love is the ideal of service. Service has not greater claim as an ideal because the present order is soon to pass away. (1) The eschatological influence reveals itself rather in the reference to the Gentile rulers. The Kingdom hope had been in Judaism since the exile a religiously interpreted longing for world lordship. Judgment should be executed on the nations and God's rule would mean the supremacy of his chosen people. (Enoch 90:30, II Baruch 39:7 etc.) Hardly in the most exalted of pre-Christian prophecies do we find eudaemonistic elements excluded. Jesus however revives the threats of Amos and Isaiah. His own work was to "the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (Mt. 10:6, Mk. 7:27) but the Kingdom was not a Jewish prerogative. The most outspoken words of judgment are uttered upon the leaders of his own people because they refused to repent at the call of John, and now rejected him. (Mt. 21:28 ff. Mk. 12:1 ff. Mt. 22:1 ff.) (2) "And I say unto you, that many shall come from



(1) We have treated such passages as Luke 14:26 as  
with the special demands to the disciples rather  
than as reflecting Jesus' attitude toward the fam-  
ily in general. The judgments of such men as Loisy  
are affected by the failure to make this distinction.



the east and the west and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the Kingdom of Heaven; but the sons of the Kingdom shall be cast forth into the outer darkness." (Mt. 8:11-12, Lk. 13:28-30) The Kingdom was not to mean the lordship of Israel. Such thoughts were not to concern them; for true greatness lay in service. He who was destined to be the lord of all in the coming Kingdom was the servant of all; he would thus give his life unstintingly. (Mk. 10:45)

("To give one's life" does not at once suggest death however. This verse containing the word  $\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\omicron\nu$ , which nowhere else is found in the New Testament, and which is a marked variant of the parallel in Luke, suggests suspicions against its genuineness which would lead us too far afield to discuss at length. Even if it is genuine however, it does not suffice to bear the weight of the atonement theology frequently read back into it from the Pauline epistles.)

The Son of Man pictured in Daniel was to bring the world into subjection. He was in the midst of them as one who served.

(Lk. 22:27) And yet the old symbols are not entirely rejected.

The gentile Luke records the word promising unto the Twelve

thrones from which they should judge over the twelve tribes of

(Lk. 22:30) (Mt. 19:28)

Israel. We must forego any attempt to reduce these words to a

consistent system. Truth sounds forth in contrasting harmonies.

The words from Jesus on marriage, divorce, and relations of the family and sexes do not belong in this chapter for we cannot accept the judgment that they are in principle controlled by the apocalyptic outlook. Only in the sense that the ideal of an indissoluble marriage in accordance with the original ordinances of God is so far above the reach of a sensuous and selfish humanity could one behold the influence of the expectation of a speedy end. (1) This leads us to a new problem arising from the question of the Sadducees concerning the marital difficulties in-



(1) The difficulty of Mark 10:30 is seen when we notice that persecutions are promised "one-hundred fold" in this time. That can apply neither to the "days of the Messiah" nor the "age to come." The recompense must be related to this age, and the brothers and sisters (all must be taken figuratively for 100 mothers can never be given) are the brothers in faith.



volved if the resurrection hope be true. (Mk. 12:18 and par.)

If the family life of the present were to continue in the resurrection, complications were obvious. Only the first half of Jesus's reply concerns our problem, that these relations no longer remain in the coming age as God in his power can create entirely new conditions of life.

How, though, shall we relate the two time periods, "in the resurrection", and "the Kingdom of God" in its final eschatological sense? We have protested again and again against unwarranted systematization, as if in the mind of Jesus all was in orderly fashion, a, b, c, etc. But it is clear that if thought through (unless we accept the improbable assumption on the basis of Mark 10:30 that Jesus distinguished between the days of the Messiah and the age to come) these two periods must coincide. Then in fact, all that Jesus has to say about the family is an "interim-ethic", if that institution be confined to this age. It is not without ambiguity to say with J. Weiss that righteousness is a demand for preparation for the Kingdom, not the Kingdom itself. He means of course not that the mark of the Kingdom will be unrighteousness, but a condition that cannot be described under the categories of the present order. It shall rather exceed any righteousness of this order, when our present limitations shall pass away, and we shall be as "angels in heaven."

The same applies to questions of property, and violence. When God's will is done on earth as it is in heaven, there will no longer be persecutions to bear in patience; (1) the conditions of wealth may be as fundamentally changed as those of the family. Of all this however Jesus does not speak at length. Not from him come extravagant fantasies of the fruitfulness of the vine and



the womb. The Kingdom is a "that", not a "what". Much more important than speculation or revelation of the coming order was what men must do to become partakers. The "interim-ethic" of Jesus does not consist simply in a series of special demands growing out of the earnestness of the time. It is not more than a norm of righteousness. Rather, it is a closer approximation to the standards of the eternal Kingdom of God. That can mean not a reversal of this "interim-ethic", but a completion. Love is eternal though its demands are temporally conditioned. The conditions will change materially in the coming age, but in "the city that hath foundations" the corner-stone will yet be love.

One final influence of eschatology on the ethics of Jesus must be noted, i. e., its incompleteness. In vain will one seek for an evaluation of profession or calling, of patriotism, or a score of other life interests.

(It is a flagrant misuse of the parables of Jesus to conclude from the fact that he often uses types of workers, he is tacitly approving of their industry. The same type of reasoning will lend his approval to the knavery of the unrighteousness servant. (Lk. 16:1-8) It cannot be too often insisted that we should apply merely the one point, not the individual features of the parables. (See Jülicher, Gleichnisreden, Vol. I.)

It does not suffice to lay the stress upon the quality, rather than the quantity of his moral maxims. Surely it is an extravagant deduction from Jesus's approval of the use of one costly box of ointment (Mk. 14:3-9) that he approved of all the aesthetic and cultural striving of our civilization. We have no doctrine of the State because he proclaimed the coming Kingdom of God - not simply an inner Kingdom that was of more importance than the outward institutions of humanity, but a Kingdom that was to supersede them. The socialist must not be accused of incompleteness because he neglects to develop an ethics based on the capit-



alistic system which to his mind must soon pass away. Jesus knew the ideals of government in his age (Mk. 10:41), the methods of taxation (Mt. 17:25); it is not because of ignorance that these spheres are so largely passed by. Everything is concentrated upon the inner relation of man to the Father and to his neighbor in expectation of the coming reign of God.



## Chapter V.

### TEACHINGS OF JESUS NOT INFLUENCED BY

### APOCALYPTIC.



(1) See R. Otto "Das Heilige" 7 ed. pg. 208  
for what appears to us to be the true approach  
to an understanding of the secret of the person-  
ality that Christian experience has found divine.



The portrayal of the ethics of Jesus in the last chapter will impress every student of the Gospels as fragmentary and one-sided. A careful survey of the ethical teaching of Jesus that bears the mark of eschatological influence leaves the indubitable impression that the message is not exhausted by this one approach. Jesus was a pneumatic prophet whose consciousness vastly transcended mere apocalyptic. (1) The Gospels portray for us also a figure who in many characteristics would be classified as a rabbinical interpreter of the law, or as a follower of the tradition of the Wisdom literature in Judaism.

(We follow here the division of Bultman. Holtzman takes as his starting point for his representation of the teaching of Jesus his relation to the Law. Here we approach difficult ground in estimating the genuineness of the tradition. The natural tendency was to mould the words into a kind of Christian catechism of prescripts to guide the young communities. It would be indeed remarkable if the words of the "risen Lord" - products of the ethical influence of the personality of Jesus, did not find their place in this tradition. If "where two or three are gathered together, there I am in the midst", they were words of their Lord. We have little confidence however in our ability to carry out this distinction in detail. It is a merit of the more recent criticism to emphasize that reception into the earliest sources is not proof of genuineness, nor is the fact that only Matthew or Luke preserve a word sufficient ground for branding it as secondary. When the literary record began, the living, oral tradition was not yet a thing of the past. Bultman asks a question which effects the so-called integrity of the gospels that must be borne in mind in evaluating the more negative criticism. "Was Q originally exclusively a collection of words of the Lord? Did it not perhaps contain beside some Apophthegmen and many words of Jesus, late Jewish sayings and rules, which were taken up by the community or arose within it - and to be sure, with the full consciousness of the fact?" (op. cit. pg. 61)

Under these categories come the greater part of the content of Jesus's moral message. In the preceding chapter we have considered chiefly motivation of activity, special demands to



(1) F. G. Peabody, "New Testament Eschatology and New Testament Ethics." Transactions of the Third International Congress of Historical Religion. 1908. pg. 308-9.



individuals because of the urgency of the time, and the limits of the ethical relationships in the coming order. The ethical radicalism of Jesus it seems to us is not uninfluenced at important points by the vivid hope. The same can hardly be said for his ethical inwardness.

Even where we have shown an influence from apocalyptic it must be borne in mind that this influence is not determinative, but has been moulded by the ethical personality of Jesus. Men before him had dreamed of a coming "good time" and their message was not love to enemies, but a rejoicing in the approach of the time of revenge. The inter-change of influence must also be taken into account. "Instead of applying the key of eschatology to New Testament ethics, may not New Testament ethics be applied as a key to its eschatology?....The apocalyptic anticipations find their parallels in much of the contemporary literature, but the ethical sagacity and sufficiency are original and unique." (1) As with the Israelitic prophets of the eighth century B. C., the sins of the present generation were signs that a turning point must be at hand. The keener ethical and religious insight into the righteousness of God led to a culminating eschatological drama. Where such interrelation is not improbable, one must be cautious in asserting categorically the primacy of one or the other.

We will arrive at our best starting point for the complementary survey by raising the question, at what point does Jesus not merely fail to reveal apocalyptic influence, but definitely break through the scheme? This is not that Jesus emphasizes the necessity of active work instead of passive



(1) E. F. Scott, "The Kingdom and the Messiah." 1910

(2) B. Duhm, "Das Kommende Reich Gottes." 1910

(3) This insight of C. A. Bernoulli in "Johannes der Täufer und die Urgemeinde", 1918, is coupled with an exegesis of individual passages that can only be labeled as the fantastic result of his whole reconstruction and an antipathy toward a summons to repentance.

Bultman admits the inevitable subjectivity in his judgment in ascribing these words to the profane proverbs that came to be a part of the tradition.



waiting. (1) Duhm is right when he affirms that it is proper that we should work for the Kingdom of God, but we cannot say that it is a Biblical attitude, or that work will bring it in.

(2) It is God's Kingdom. Jesus gives exhortations to moral faithfulness and that ethical preparation necessary to participation. But human effort was not the ground for its speedy expectation. The break with apocalyptic is to be found rather in the speeches on "light". (3) Less certain is the relation of the word about salt. Mark (9:49-50) introduces it to close a section on stumbling-blocks to personal salvation and Luke (14:34 ff.) to illustrate the worthlessness of the disciple who is not willing to sacrifice. Only Matthew (5:13) has the metaphor of the "salt of the land", in all probability modelled as a parallel to the word on light which follows.

Whether the speech in Matthew 5:14-16 was originally a metaphor or a simple comparison is of no consequence for the application. The disciples have a task in letting the light of their good works shine before men. We have no right to carry back to Jesus Paul's horror of the idea that good works can commend us to God. The essential agreement of the two is seen however when we recognize that these "good works" neither constitute the Kingdom nor bring it in. They are the light that should not be hid because of fruitful social influence. Here is the entering wedge for the realization of social tasks in the present order.

(The other parable of light (Mt. 6:22-3, Lk. 11:34-6) does not belong in this connection. Luke's order is due to "Stichwort" arrangement. It is unnecessary to enter into the various endeavors to decipher the exact original meaning of the parable. See Jülicher, Gleichnisreden II pg. 98)



(1) That we follow here Matthew's order in the Sermon on the Mount does not mean that we look upon this discourse as a connected speech. Rather, the evangelist and his precursors have practiced the same systematization we are endeavoring to give.

(2) Is it a mark of a later generation to speak of "entering into the Kingdom" instead of "Thy Kingdom come"? See Wernle "Jesus", pg. 221 ff.



The criticism of all teleological ethics on the ground that the only good is good will was not an original insight of Kant. Rather the true inwardness and personal character of morality is the heart of the teaching of Jesus. The good works that Jesus calls for are not determined by the outward act, but the inner intention and motive. (1) A man has not kept the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill" if he bears hatred in his heart. (Mt. 5:21) Purity is not determined by physical acts, but by the mind and heart. (Mt. 5:27 ff. "By their fruits ye shall know them", but the fruit is a product of the inner constitution of the man. As an evil tree cannot bring forth good fruit, neither can good works spring from anything but a good heart. (Mt. 7:16 ff) Hence we must look to the inner eye, the heart, for <sup>is</sup> that be darkness, the whole life must be dark. (Mt. 6:22 ff.) In only one sense can eschatological influence be postulated here - the sublime elevation of the standard could only be realized in a community such as the direct intervention of an Almighty God might inaugurate. The emphasis on the inner motivation of conduct places an eternal cleft between law and ethics. Only the tribunal of God can acquit a man, judging by the moral standards of Jesus.

The six examples of the higher righteousness demanded for entrance into the Kingdom of Heaven, which Matthew has collected, may be divided into two groups. (2) The first (Mt. 5:21ff. 27 ff., 31 ff), which we have treated above, give a deeper and more inner interpretation to the injunctions laid down in the law of Moses. They represent truly a "fulfillment" and not a destruction of the law. The other group however not only goes beyond the customary interpretation of the law; they change its



letter and prescription. To forbid divorce under any circumstances, and to replace the *lex talionis* with the ideal of no revenge was not to give a deeper inner significance of the law, but to specifically supersede its requirements with others.

(If the clause in Mt. 5:32 be original *παρεκτός λόγου πορνείας* it can only be because the Jewish law prescribed the death penalty for the guilty party in adultery. Because of the absence of the usual opening formula, Matthew may look upon verses 31-2 as supplementary to his discussion of adultery, and hence the more exact qualifying clause in contrast to the unconditional statement in Mark 10:2-12. The latter form is the more likely because Jesus was protesting against the lax divorce proceedings of his time, rather than laying down edicts to be followed by law courts. The morality of Jesus was based not upon law, even a perfect law, but upon religion. This contrast affords the weakness of any so-called "case method of scientific ethics")

It is true that the advance is in the same direction as is aimed by the original law, but it comes not through a broader interpretation of the injunction, but through supplanting it with a loftier ideal. We have found but a quite doubtful connection between the inner standard of Jesus and a speedy, miraculous consummation of the Kingdom. Can we say the same however for this independent attitude toward the law? Can it not be that the vivid apocalyptic hope has been a strong factor in reducing his interest in the details of the Law of the Fathers?

Before attempting an answer to this question, we must make a brief survey of the evidence concerning his attitude toward the law. Where such an influence should most be felt would lie in the ritualistic prescriptions. Yet here we find considerable interest. Cleansed lepers are instructed to go to the priests for confirmation of their cleanness. (Lk. 17:14) The cleansing of the Temple (Mk. 11:15 ff.) was certainly prompted by a love and respect for "my Father's House." If the incident of the Tem-







ple tax be accepted as historic (Mt. 17:24 ff.) it proves no hostility to the official cult. Jesus certainly expected the early destruction of the Temple (Mk. 14:2) yet this did not diminish his genuine love for the institutions of his fathers. Jesus' disregard of ritualism and legalism is not motivated by interest in a coming order which shall supersede that of the present. Regard for present human values and zeal for an inner morality are the sufficient justification in each case. The Sabbath laws are broken by Jesus and his disciples (1), not because this institution has no significance for the dawning "age to come" but because the divine purpose was being thwarted by their petty distinctions. "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath," (Mk. 2:27) and therefore it must be lawful to heal and do necessary work in fulfilling this function. The appeal from the written law to his own insight into the needs of humanity is not justified simply because the end was near, but because "here was more than Solomon." His precedent in commending the enlightened moral conscience against even the highest tradition and authority is a new wine that has continuously been rending old wine skins. The moral is not that which can happen to a man from without, but that which proceedeth from his own heart. (Mk. 7:1-23) Evil thoughts, not foods, are genuinely defiling. Clean hands come not from ceremonial washings, but from honest dealings with men.

Bernoulli's insight is correct, "Whosoever has built his hope on the last judgment, has long set himself in opposition to the sacrificial service of the Temple." (2) But Jesus's belief in the speedy coming of the judgment did not induce him to



(1) Lk. 18:9 ff. The term justified in verse 14 may be eschatological in reference, but not necessarily apocalyptic.



to give that motivation to sincere, inner morality. As a Galilean, his contact with Temple abuses was not so close, though his attitude toward the same is clear from the Gospels. But here there is no demonstrable apocalyptic influence. The Temple would be destroyed in the approaching catastrophe, but until then it was not condemned. The word regarding the temple "raised in three days not made with hands" has been so influenced by the actual resurrection appearances that its original significance is not to be absolutely made out. (Mk. 14:58, Jn. 2:19) The spiritual worship fore-told to the woman of Samaria (Jn. 4:23-4) is exposed to the same question of Hellenistic influences as are many other passages in John. It is the logical consequence however of the criticism of ceremonialism, and the personal, spiritual religion which the Synoptics breathe. As with the great Christological affirmations of the Fourth Gospel (as John 14:9) it is an explicit formulation of the intuitions implicate in the earlier tradition. Among the most far-reaching indications of the supremacy of the personality of Jesus is the definite superseding on certain points of the Law, recognized as divine in authority and origin, by his <sup>own</sup> insight.

It is but part of the emphasis on the inner character of morality to stress absolute sincerity. Our speech should be so sincere that no formula or oath could strengthen the impression of its veracity. (Mt. 5:33-7 and par.) We have noted in the previous chapter passages which bear the mark of eschatological influence. The humble sincerity of the publican's prayer lacks that note. (1) And so we could go through all of the chief sins pointed out in the last chapter and show how Jesus on



(1) Heiler, "Das Gebet", pg. 141 for illustrations from the history of religion. Seneca, Plutarch, and Epictetus use the name as well as Jewish writers of the time. See Dalman, "Die Worte Jesu."



occasion gave no apocalyptic motivation. Riches were harmful to the soul, not because the present order was to be superseded by a divine one, but because our own lives might be taken at any time. (Lk. 12:13-21)

(It will be noted here that these passages are largely in Luke rather than Matthew and Mark. Does this distinction reveal the individual evangelist rather than actual historical differences? The extent to which that is true admits of opinions rather than proof.)

The condemnation of the unforgiving spirit we have found to be rooted in God's own forgiveness. This brings us to the character of God, the central question for religion and the one where apocalyptic sheds very little light on the message of Jesus.

The forgiving Father whom Jesus makes not the center but the presupposition of his message, is a very different figure from the God about whose plans for the universe the pessimistic author of IV Ezra broods. In our discussion of the ethics of Jesus it is not necessary to enter the debate as to just what measure of originality is to be found in Jesus's conception of God. To trace the "genealogy of ideas" is a very difficult matter from the scattered literary remains of a previous generation. To trace their effect in the lives of men is more important. True, Jesus brought not "new God." But the documents of the early Church reveal an intimate fellowship with God in Christ that was something new, no matter how prevalent may have been the idea of God as Father. As Heiler has shown, Father is the simplest and most apparent human analogy to God. By itself, the word proves nothing as to character. Only a lofty conception, of fatherhood can make it a significant title. (1)

More important than the name is the personal trust in



-74-

God's loving care which Jesus exemplified and commended. <sup>Even</sup> food and raiment ~~are~~ are not to be objects of anxious worry ~~as~~ with the Gentiles (Mt. 6:32) who know not the solicitude of the divine love. For the Heavenly Father knoweth the needs of His children and He will provide. He loves not alone those who love Him, but His forgiving grace is boundless. The woman of the street does not need to hesitate to ask forgiveness upon repentance, (Lk. 7:36 ff.) and the most touching incidents of seeking the lost (Luke 15) are but inadequate pictures of the seeking love of God. Even a minimum of faith will achieve ~~marvels~~ marvels because it is faith in God. (Lk. 17:6,20; Mt. 21:21; Mk. 11:22-3) Faith is the ground of most of the healings recounted in the Gospels. (Mk. 10:52, 2:5, 5:34; Mt. 9:22,29, 15:28, Lk. 7:9, 17:19)

The trust in ~~the~~ fatherly goodness of God does not depend upon apocalyptic eschatology. A contrary relation is not unthinkable, that belief in the character of God might be the grounding of the expectation that he would intervene in a sinful world and establish a reign of righteousness. That was a factor in the development of Jewish apocalyptic, but it was bound <sup>up</sup> with an inadequate conception of the righteousness of God, <sup>which</sup> that did not escape a narrow nationalism, and confused the enemies of the nation with the enemies of the Almighty God. As a matter of fact, the development of apocalyptic views usually led to a stress upon the avenging wrath of God rather than upon his 'loving care.' This fact forms the basis for the thesis of the recent volume by Dougal and Emmet, "The Lord of Thought", which is in a certain sense a polemic against our position. We are thus warranted in making a somewhat extended digression to consider their position.



As the title would indicate, these authors attempt to por-  
tray a Jesus with a carefully rounded out system of ideas which  
are essentially harmonious. That the higher specialists between po-  
larities of thought, or that the slight divergence in theo-  
retical inconsistencies, as these exist, is to them as regarded as  
to be the criterion for the genuineness of passages. It  
must be clearly seen that this is the presupposition of the au-  
thors rather than the result of their investigation. A second  
presupposition is universalism. Underlying the book is a devel-  
opment from the point of view that might expect retrogressive. Sin  
has its consequences, it is clearly emphasized, but the idea of  
a judgment (except in a judgmental sense) is excluded from the idea  
of God. This may be true, but we must admit that that fact  
determines what is to be found in the doctrine of God. There  
is a wide gap leading to destruction and a narrow gate  
which is found in Rev. 3:10-14. This is, it is true,  
consequence rather than redemption, but must we not allow  
that a special crisis was at hand. The coming of Christ King  
we have shown to be both a gospel of God's love, and at the same  
time a threat to those who would love as part of God's  
will was done. The "Interpretation" of Job's account to mean  
not a statement of revelation to the people, but the truth,  
"Heaven and the Kingdom will come." Hence the Kingdom will  
not come unless all men repent and all are forgiven of the Father  
and of God must love him and direct into the de-  
struction in the "true way".

(10) W. R. Inge, "The Idea of Progress." page 21.

Both of St. Paul's two letters will give the impression that if a  
man is given grace enough, he must necessarily become perfect. (1)  
The pathway to the understanding of Jesus Christ is found



As the title would indicate, these authors attempt to portray a Jesus with a carefully rounded out system of ideas which are absolutely harmonious. That He might oscillate between polarities of thought, or that He might give hospitality to theoretical inconsistencies, as does Paul, is to them so repulsive as to become the criterion for the genuineness of passages. It must be clearly seen that this is the presupposition of the authors rather than the result of their investigation. A second presupposition is universalism. Underlying the book is a revulsion from all punishment that might appear retributive. Sin has its consequences, it is clearly emphasized, but the idea of a judgment (except in a Johannine sense) is excluded from the idea of God. This may be true, but we cannot admit that that fact determines what is to be found in the Synoptic Gospels. There we have a wide gate leading to destruction and a narrow gate which is found but by few. (Mt. 7:13-4) This is, it is true, consequence rather than recompense, but Emmet will not allow that a special crisis was at hand. The coming of God's Kingdom we have shown to be both a Gospel of Good News, and at the same time a threat to those who would have no part where only God's will was done. But Emmet "interprets" Jesus's summons to mean not a tremendous motivation to repentance, but the truism, "Repent and the Kingdom will come." Hence the Kingdom would not come unless all men repented and the very idea of the Fatherhood of God must push into the dim and distant future the destruction in the "broad way". Emmet shares what the gloomy Dean of St. Paul's has called "the queer assumption, that if a man is given time enough, he must necessarily become perfect." (1)

The pathway to the understanding of Jesus lies in forsak-



ing the systematization of the scholar and breathing the freer air of the pulsating prophet summoned to exalted heroism by a few inner certainties. Foremost among these was that his own forgiving and redeeming ministry was but a carrying out of the will of his Heavenly Father whose perfection called even for the love of his enemies. But this Father was so much in earnest, that His Kingdom must surely come, and that, in the very near future. We believe that Emmet is right in ascribing many details in the parables of judgment to current Jewish ideas rather than to the mind of Christ. We have utterly no interest in supporting the medieval doctrines of <sup>a hell of</sup> eternal fire. The distinction in causality between the direct vengeance of an outraged God and the working of cause and effect in the individual sinner is undoubtedly necessary, though it leads to theoretical difficulties the minute we attempt to systematize. ~~But xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ Emmet is led astray by his grouping of all apocalyptic under one heading, and assuming that if Jesus held apocalyptic ideas, they must have been of this type. The God of conventional apocalyptic was seeking vengeance on the national enemies of Israel, or else was the avenger punishing all who failed to keep His law punctiliously. Jesus sought to show men a very different sort of Being. His Father was bringing <sup>and the</sup> to pass a new Kingdom into which only the repentant, poor in spirit could enter. It was not because God was an avenging tyrant that "Many were called, and few chosen" (Mt. 22:14), or that "None of these men which were first bidden shall taste of my supper." (Lk. 14:24) It is not said to fear him who hath the will to cast into hell, but "Him who hath the power." (Lk. 12:5) The God who loves even those



(1) We have treated this same theme in the previous chapter. There we pointed out indications of the psychological conditioning. Here we contrast with contemporary apocalyptic and relate to permanent significance.



who hate Him will not seek to destroy His children, but even He cannot arbitrarily make them partakers of the new Kingdom as long as they refuse the invitation granted. We do have in Jesus consequence and not judgment. But a great crisis <sup>was</sup> at hand, which provided a unique challenge to the heroic. Emmet does not save the character of the God of Jesus. He only succeeds in diluting the ethical radicalism. A pale universalism is almost as vicious as the blasphemies of our "hell-fire preachers". Faith knows a world in which risk is not excluded, but where also there is a spiritual power invoking our trust. Apocalyptic eschatology spoke exclusively the language of rewards. Jesus broke through this with the controlling idea of God's Fatherhood, for in the divine family rewards can never be constitutive. But this Father was not the indulgent weakling of some of our soft-hearted contemporaries. The figures of a master and slave (Lk. 17:7-10), king and subjects (Mt. 18:23, 22:2 ff.) are parables and not allegories, but the same is true of Father and children, and the truths under each figure must find their place if we are to be true to the evidence of the God of Jesus.

The brotherly love that knows no bounds is a further point at which Jesus breaks through the ideas of apocalyptic. (1) This is the human complement to the God to whose absolute allegiance Jesus called men, an allegiance which might give place for the payment of money to the Caesar who coined it (Mk. 12:13 ff. ) but which would allow neither Mammon nor Caesar to divide our service with Him. Such division of heart was as impossible as for a man to be slave unto two Masters. (Mt. 6:24; Lk. 16:13) We should love God with all our mind and soul. The natural corrolary of



love to this God must be a love of our neighbor that shall be as broad as humanity and as intense as self-love. Apocalyptic had fed upon hate, and had encouraged the belief in the righteousness of hating the enemies of God. The "Golden Rule" (Mt. 7:12) may savor of the utilitarianism of the name that it has come to bear, but read against the background of the self-giving ministry of Jesus and such illuminating examples as the Good Samaritan for whom need was a sufficient call to service, regardless of the person of the unfortunate, it loses every element of calculation, and becomes the formulation of an active, boundless good will, like unto the good will of the Father who desires his children to be perfect, even as He is perfect. (Mt. 5:48)

Even here however we cannot escape the eschatological question. We may well wonder what connection there might be between binding up the wounds of a bandit victim and the expectation of a speedy end to the present age. But Luke, who usually reduces apocalyptic imagery to the minimum (or inserts a minimum, depending on whether we consider Luke or Matthew the more faithful in transcribing the primitive tradition) records the parable in answer to the question of a scribe who had come seeking to know what he must do to inherit eternal life. It is hardly necessary to decide between the setting of the Great Commandment in Mark and in Luke. It was to be true in the coming Kingdom, but it was also true then. But as a matter of fact, the attachment of the story of the Good Samaritan is purely editorial on the part of the evangelist. It is a fine example of the way to show neighborliness, but not to define who is my neighbor. For, if love of neighbor is limited by character instead of







country, it is still limited. Of one thing, however, we can be certain, the shortness of the time neither adds<sup>to</sup> nor detracts from the urgency of such loving service.

It is but a step to Jesus's criterion of greatness. The great man is the humble servant, yea, the slave of all. (Mk. 10: 42-4; Lk. 22:25-6) It is<sup>a</sup> paradoxical way of emphasizing the humility of true greatness; that its essence lies not in the power of a monarch to make all obey his behest, but in the personal contribution which the individual can make to the welfare of all. It is not to be attained by striving for fame, but by self-abnegation. He who would see in Luke 14:7-11 simply clever advice in social etiquette has missed the radical re-evaluation of life which Jesus gave. "He who humbleth himself shall be exalted", not because that is a surer way toward personal elevation, but because lowliness of mind is essential to effective service. Those who think that these words exclude the possibility that Jesus could have made Messianic claims for himself are guilty of that exaggerated literalness that excludes any appreciation of true greatness. It is not humility, but a false meekness to deny what one actually is. These words were spoken for the self-satisfied Pharisees (Lk. 18:9 ff.) and the wrangling disciples (Mk. 9:33 ff.) By placing a child in their midst, Jesus turned their egoistic question into a demand for new birth.

Here again the ideal is in some instances placed in relation to the coming Kingdom. (1) That is the case in Mark 9:33 and even more definitely so in the incident in Mark 10:35 of the request of the sons of Zebedee for the chief seats. Luke however has recorded the words on the greatness of lowly service







in a very different setting (Lk. 22:25-7) and without reference to his death as a *λύτρον*, which affords very strong grounds for looking upon the Lukan account as the more original. The coming Kingdom is for the humble, 'tis true, and they will be its great ones. But even now He lives on that principle and His followers are called upon to do likewise. Jesus is promising no chief seats in the Kingdom (Mk. 10:40) but He is calling His disciples then and there to the greatness of humble service. Once more the strands have crossed. But that reveals the fact that apocalyptic eschatology is not the sole motive with Jesus. At the same time we have confirmation of the vividness of the Kingdom hope.

The family is the only institution upon which Jesus may be said to have left any considerable teaching. It is true that preparation for the Kingdom stood above family ties. This is a great fault in the ethic of Jesus in the minds of those steeped in Confucian morality. Yet, "the family in the pure and chaste meaning of the late Jewish morality affords the symbols for the highest designations of God, the name for the final religious goal, the pattern for the band of Jesus disciples, the most frequent material of the parables, and to this extent is one of the fundamental presuppositions of his perception." (1) Instead of a liberal attitude, as toward Sabbath observance, nothing short of an indissoluble union could satisfy his ideal of the family. (Mk. 10:1-12, Mt. 5:32, Lk. 16:18, Mt. 19:1-12) But as with the Sabbath, so here; Jesus grounds his insight in the original divine purpose which is being thwarted. It is not because of the shortness of the time that easy divorce is attacked, but because love should be eternal. Still, present-day exper-



(1) op. cit. pg. 40

(2) Not more than that can be concluded from Mt. 3:9 - Lk. 3:8 in the preaching of John the Baptist.

(3) See Volz, op. cit. for exhaustive references.

(4) Sybilline Oracles, Bk. III, 740 is about the only exception in apocalyptic literature. The passages in The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs are generally looked upon as Christian interpolations. See editions of Charles and Kautzsch.

(5) Compare in this regard with Stephen's speech in the seventh chapter of Acts.



ience in the frank consideration of problems of personal relations enforces the words of Troeltsch, "So little as the demands (of Jesus) can be deduced in themselves from the expectation of the end, one must the more consider that their radicalism and unconcernedness with their possibility and feasibility can only be understood from the standpoint (of eschatology)." (1)

At one final point must we emphasize the transcendence of apocalyptic by Jesus. One of the gravest ethical defects of Judaism was the national exclusiveness of the apocalyptic hope. The prophetic emphasis upon righteousness led to the exclusion of the Jews who did not keep the law rather than to the inclusion of righteous heathen. (2) In some passages the heathen remain as subjects of Israel instead of being destroyed; (3) others accede a place to them if they become proselytes, but full participation was not accorded the heathen. (4) This is not difficult to understand, for salvation usually included salvation from foreign oppression. But with Jesus the prayer is for salvation from evil, not Rome. (Mt. 6:13) The opposing power is not the nations of the world, but the Kingdom of Satan. (Mt. 12:25 ff.) Those for whom the Kingdom is prepared are the poor, the meek, the peace-makers, the hungry. Nationality is in no sense determinative; characteristics which can mark humanity are the qualifications. The ideal is no Jewish hero such as Abraham, but God the Father of all men. (Mt. 5:48) The illustrations of his loving care are not from Jewish history (5) but from the daily experiences of life. (Mt. 5:45 ff.)

But despite the theoretical universalism of Jesus, we find very specific evidence that the mission of himself and



(1) Mt. 13:38, the explanation of the parable of the tares is from the evangelist, but even if it were genuine, it is too slender an indication of a program outside Israel to alter the judgment above.



his disciples was only to the Jews. (Mt. 10:5-6, Mk. 7:27) This is not altered by any outlook he may have had at the close of his life of a mission to the heathen after his death. (Mk. 14:9) (1) If the twelve Apostles are to judge the twelve tribes of Israel, the national perspective is not altogether lost. (Mt. 19:28) Yet the polarities in Jesus are to be found here also. A different attitude may have arisen because of the opposition of the Pharisees. Their rejection of his message led him to turn elsewhere. Responsiveness was found not alone in the despised publicans and sinners, but among occasional heathen and Samaritans with whom he came into chance contact on his wanderings. No greater faith was found than in a heathen centurion (Mt. 8:5 ff.); the point of the story of the Syro-Phoenician woman is that Jesus did help her (Mk. 7:24 ff.); a Samaritan is the model of love (Lk. 10:29 ff.) and another of gratitude (Lk. 17:16). The heathen in past generations were more responsive than the Jewish leaders. (Lk. 11:31-2) God's judgment has fallen upon them (Mk. 12:1-12; Mt. 22:1-14, (the heathen) Lk. 14:16-24) "And they shall come from the east and west, and from the north and south, and shall sit down in the Kingdom of God." (Lk. 13:29)

But can we divide the ministry of Jesus into a period exclusively Jewish and one in which the force of circumstances pointed him to a wider horizon? Our study of the sources has shown the subjectivity of these theories of development. The most that can be said is that there is a high degree of a priori probability for the view.

In any case, the implicit universalism of Jesus follows directly from his intense individualism. Apocalyptic eschatology



proclaimed an essentially social hope - a salvation for the group in the new day. As we will see, that is not entirely lost in Jesus, but the emphasis upon the motivation, places the individual at the center as never before. The individual heathen as well as the individual Jew might share in the coming Kingdom. This was not because of the shortness of the time, but because of the ethical earnestness of Jesus, his perception of God as the Father of all His children, and the comparative response he himself found among men. The universalism of Jesus, but one aspect of the boundless love for all men, is not a deduction from, but a break with, apocalyptic eschatology.



Chapter VI.

THE RADICALISM OF JESUS IN RELATION TO APOCALYPTIC  
ESCHATOLOGY IN THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH.



It is not our purpose in this chapter to attempt a history of the exegesis of the Synoptic Gospels. We have a more important and fortunately a far simpler task. How have the heroic ethical teachings in the Sermon on the Mount and kindred sections of the Synoptics been related to the apocalyptic element when the former have been taken seriously? Has the *lex Christi* become a living part of the life of men without a revitalizing of the eschatological note, or have they usually accompanied each other?<sup>7</sup> Logically there may be no connection between eschatology and making earnest with the injunction "swear not at all" (Mt. 5:34), but the psychological connection may still be there. While such an investigation can give no absolute proof, even if the evidence were preponderately one-sided, it will not be without value in forming our final judgments.

Two factors enter in to confuse the issue, but which fortunately tend to neutralize each other. First, chiliasm, or the apocalyptic eschatological scheme on the basis of Daniel, Mark XIII and Revelation with a thousand year reign of Christ on earth, came to be officially branded as heresy in the Church. Its hold on the early Church long after the Gospel had passed out from the Palestinian confines which were the mother-ground of Jewish apocalyptic, is witnessed by the fact that Montanus, Justin, Irenaeus, and Tertullian all held strenuously to the doctrine. It was a category however that was inherently foreign to the Greek mind. The spiritualizing tendencies coming particularly from the Origenistic school finally gained the upper hand.

(This explains also why eastern monasticism (Montanism



(1) Augustine "Civitas Dei". XX:9



hardly comes under that name) was not moved by eschatological influences. Origen is rightly named (Harnack "Das Mönchtum" pg. 23) as answerable for the monastic inclinations of the eastern Church. The dualism lying at the root is Neo-Platonic rather than Jewish-Persian apocalyptic.)

Augustine sealed the fate of chiliasm when he identified the thousand year reign of Christ with the rule of the Church here and now. (1) Thenceforth a revival of apocalyptic was difficult wherever reverence for the Church was strong. We have here a valuable negative result. During the period when the theory of the Church as a sacramental dispenser of divine grace reigned supreme, when two levels of morality were accepted as the social teaching of the Church, - the compromises with the world necessary to the average laity and the rigorous asceticism of the monastery as the way of perfection, - when the vision of the coming Kingdom of God on earth faded before the present reality of the Church of Christ, then apocalyptic eschatology lay dormant and lacked vital grip on the hearts of men. Only the monk in his retired life was expected to bow beneath the yoke of the *lex Christi*. He did not need the encouragement that God would soon marvelously intervene in behalf of his followers, for he had left the world under the conviction that the way of perfection was not to be found there.

(But see Harnack "Das Mönchtum" pg. 38. "Latin monasticism has preserved in distinction from the Greek (but not the coptic) an apocalyptic-chiliastic element which has to be sure often remained long latent, but always blossomed forth again at critical moments." We are well aware that as the official Church in the West utilized the monastic movement to its own ends, the orders became so largely secularized that they were distinguished from "the world" by little else than costume. But the relaxing of the monastic fervor brought with it even less reason for taking refuge in apocalyptic hopes.)

We must not overlook on the other hand a certain artificial connection that lay between a revival of a literal fol-



lowing of the words of Jesus and a revitalizing of eschatological hopes. Both were in large measure due to a biblicism grounded in verbal inspiration. This was of course much more the case among Protestant sects than among Catholics. Yet, to make earnest with the injunctions of the Sermon on the Mount meant to go back of the dogmas of the Church to the New Testament itself, and the same parchment that revealed the Apostolic ideals of poverty promised that the Son of Man would return on the clouds of heaven to set up his Kingdom with power. We can never absolutely exclude the possibility that whenever apocalyptic hopes accompany a revival of the preaching of the *lex Christi* among the laity, this is due to the common grounding of both in literal biblicism rather than to any logical or even psychological connection.

The Waldensians were the most important of the sects that came into prominence during the twelfth century. We cannot do better than to quote the summary which Troeltsch gives us of the <sup>sect</sup> whole/movement. "Its basal factor is the early Christian individualism, revived by the New Testament and breaking forth in opposition against the materialized institution of the Church and the linking of the individuals in the practical exercise of good works with a strong indifference <sup>toward</sup> and enmity against the world and its institutions of power and possessions. It is the union typical for the sect of religious individualism and moral rigorism, which latter stands in relation to the Sermon on the Mount and the absolute Natural Law, as it also corresponds to the whole Christian tradition since the earliest community, and furthermore to the monastic orders. The bond of fellowship is the verbally understood "law of Christ", and the setting up, based on this law, of missionaries and apostles, poor and living only for the



community: the latter were often priests as well and stood then in the forefront, but their individuality and efficiency depended first of all upon their personal moral purity and vigor. The families teaching themselves against materialism and "the fleshly Christ." However, the law of Jesus is at the same time the law of nature in the most rigid sense, and as such, wholly independent of any far-reaching schemes of love and a corresponding dogmatics, only necessarily united with the historical idea of freedom and equality. As a concept entirely different element having influence upon the social structure is the social element in the prophetic in which the social movement is directed to a little circle, holds fast the Christian universalism as a principle to be worked by God in the new age, whereby systematic freedom, and equality are realized as the basis of the new age.

(1) E. Troeltsch, "Die Soziallehre der Christliche Kirche." Pg. 392

At first glance, the most available example of a follower of the law Christ appears to contradict the thesis that there is a real connection between that and apocalypticism. St. Francis of Assisi not only lived the apostolic life of repentance, self-denial, and unselfish love, but sought in all circumstances to win the world for his ideal. With his entire soul he living and active in the world, and he was not a man of the world, but a man of the world.

It seems to be a contradiction that a man who lived the apostolic life of repentance, self-denial, and unselfish love, but sought in all circumstances to win the world for his ideal. With his entire soul he living and active in the world, and he was not a man of the world, but a man of the world. It seems to be a contradiction that a man who lived the apostolic life of repentance, self-denial, and unselfish love, but sought in all circumstances to win the world for his ideal. With his entire soul he living and active in the world, and he was not a man of the world, but a man of the world.

It seems to be a contradiction that a man who lived the apostolic life of repentance, self-denial, and unselfish love, but sought in all circumstances to win the world for his ideal. With his entire soul he living and active in the world, and he was not a man of the world, but a man of the world. It seems to be a contradiction that a man who lived the apostolic life of repentance, self-denial, and unselfish love, but sought in all circumstances to win the world for his ideal. With his entire soul he living and active in the world, and he was not a man of the world, but a man of the world.



community; the latter were often priests as well and stood then in the succession, but their justification and efficacy depended first of all upon their personal moral purity and rigor. The Pauline teaching disappears almost entirely behind the "lex Christi." Moreover, the law of Jesus is at the same time the law of nature in the most rigid sense, and as such, usually thought of as a far-reaching communism of love and a corresponding charity, only occasionally united with the democratic ideas of freedom and equality. As a second entirely different element having influence beside these major streams is the mystic element in religion....And finally, with the whole is joined the apocalyptic prophecy in which the sect movement confined at first to a little circle, holds fast the Christian universalism as a miracle to be worked by God in the new age, wherewith mysticism, freedom, and equality are united as the ideals of the new aegn."(1)

At first glance, the most notable example of a follower of the lex Christi appears to contradict the thesis that there is a real connection between that and apocalyptic hopes. St. Francis of Assisi not only lived the apostolic life of repentance, self-denial, and sacrificing love, but sought in all earnestness to win the world for this ideal. With him surely can no living apocalyptic hope be established. It seems to ~~me~~<sup>us</sup> however that a quite adequate explanation is at hand in the fact that Francis was at all times a most obedient son of the Church. The Kingdom of God could not be found outside this divinely ordained institution for salvation. He actively sought to leaven the whole lump with the yeast of apostolic poverty. But as the Church harnessed these powers of her obedient son, the salt quickly



(1) A. Harnack. Op. cit. pg. 56.

(2) See Heussi, "Kompendium der Kirchengeschichte," 261, Troeltsch, op. cit. pg. 391, etc.

(3) Wyclif, "De civili dominico." (ed. Poole 1885 ff.)  
quoted in Troeltsch; op. cit. 395.



lost its savor, for a secularized Church could make little of "poverty". Apocalyptic hopes quickly entered into that wing of the Fransiscan movement that sought to remain true to the master's ideals. (1) That movement received the name of Joachism from its prophet. (2) Only a new revelation of the spirit could save the Church, which revealed by its worldliness and opposition to reform that the Pope was the heir of Constantine rather than the follower of Peter.

Wyclif again proclaimed the moral law of Christ and waged warfare against the ecclesiastical system of redemption. He did not draw radical social consequences however. (3) This may account in some measure for the absence of an apocalyptic stream. The Hussite movement however was not lacking in these features. It was in this sense a fore-runner of the later protestant "sects." These found the most characteristic expression in the "Baptist" movement. "Its real essence was the community of saints, in the sense of the Sermon on the Mount, and of a free fellowship of mature Christians; non-participation in the State, office, law, power, oath, war, and capital punishment; the silent enduring of suffering and injustice as Christ on the cross; the close social alliance of the members through care for the poor and provident funds so that no one in the community need beg or suffer hunger; the stringent control of the worthiness of the members of the community through excommunication and discipline; a simple cult of pure biblical edification through chosen preachers and pastors who were ordained by the synods of the community by the laying on of hands. They recognized the moral natural law but fought the relative exposition received by the Church, the compromise of the natural law with original sin. In general,



(1) Troeltsch, op. cit. page 803-5.

(2) Troeltsch, op. cit. page. 818



the natural law and the law of Christ identical with it was not feasible in the world, for the world is the seat of the devil suffering, and endurance, till the second coming of Christ for which the pious prepared themselves by separation from the world."

(1) The ideals of Christ as given in the Synoptics may have been misunderstood, but there can be no doubt that therein lay the stimulus to these movements. And the same Bible that contained them seemed also to reveal the means by which the final universality of Christianity could be maintained, the intervention of God through the visible second coming of Christ.

In England at the time of Cromwell, when the attempt was made to establish a theocratic Commonwealth, we meet this spirit again. The main body was satisfied with the more practical law of the Old Testament, to be brought in by the army when necessary. Radical spirits were not lacking however who looked for the intervention of God in a marvelous way for the erection of a genuine Commonwealth of God. "In the Barebone Parliament finally Harrison and his followers wanted to remove all law and courts in order to prepare a people freed from such worldly things for the return of Christ. They even attacked private property and desired to dissolve the ecclesiastical system completely by removing its financial foundation in the tithe. All earthly authority should be destroyed in favor of the heavenly King and the coming Kingdom of God." (2) Once more we must make clear that we do not mean to leave the impression that the heretics and radical sectarians have alone understood the message of Christ. St. Francis, who was a most faithful son of the Church and in whom no apocalyptic influence is traceable, was far more genuine and beautiful in his imitation of Christ than any of the others.



All too frequently the spirit of the Apocalypse almost hides the religious, social enthusiasm of the movement. Indeed, among modern millenarians, the apocalyptic element is the one all-absorbing factor. The coming of the Kingdom is only detained by endeavors to patch up or reform the present social order, which is the "world" in enmity to God. Man's only task is to gather the elect and fulfill such conditions of the end as are dependent upon him, as "preach the gospel for a witness to the ends of the earth." It is only when we come to examine the nature of this coming divine order that we see the influence of the Sermon on the Mount. In this unregenerate world, it is impossible, but God will usher it in after Christ has come again in judgment upon the wicked.

(J. Weiss has given<sup>us</sup> a good sketch of "Die Idee des Reiches Gottes in der Theologie". Giessen, 1901. How far that departed from the biblical background may be seen from one or two definitions. "The ethical state is the Kingdom of God on earth." (Kant) "The Kingdom of God is the highest good which God has realized in men, and at the same time their common task, since the rule of God has its continuance only in the exercise of obedience by men." (Ritschl)

With Tolstoy we come to a very different situation. Here was a man who stood on the heights of modern science and culture. In middle life he realized the aimlessness of his existence and found the meaning of life only when he had turned his back upon civilization and its values and in the simpler sphere of peasant life sought to carry out the law of love. He summarized the five commands of Christ thus: (a) to live at peace with all the world; (b) to lead a pure life; (c) not swear; (d) never withstand evil; (e) give up every boundary between nations. His was an active appeal to the will. It was not neces-



sary for the individual to wait upon the mass in order to accept what he considered to be the Christian world view. Nothing was further from his thought world than the ideas of Persian-Jewish eschatology.

Yet, when we look more closely, we find that Tolstoy takes refuge in a modern type of apocalyptic when he endeavors to think through the universality of the new ideal. The passages contain so effective a re-statement of the belief in catastrophic changes in society that we will quote from his at some length. "The defenders of the present order wrongly assert that if in the course of eighteen centuries only a small percentage of men have adopted Christianity, many times eighteen centuries will be needed before all others do so. This insistence is false, because it fails to consider that there is another way to arrive at truth, and to effect the transition from one form of the organization of life to another beside the inner. This consists in the fact that men not only accept truth because they recognize it with prophetic feeling and in experience, but also because when the propagation of truth has reached a certain level, the people who stand on this stage of development accept it together in mere confidence in those who have accepted it innerly and ordered their lives by it.

"The progress accelerates like an avalanche till the whole mass suddenly goes over to the new truth and so a new organization arises which corresponds to this new truth..... The men who go over to a new truth which has reached a certain degree of extension always go over at one time enmasse."

"Therefore the change in the life of mankind, in which the mighty will renounce their power and no one will step into



(2) W. R. Inge, "The Idea of Progress". 1921. pg. 21.



their place, need not be delayed till all men one after another till the very last have carefully appropriated the Christian view of life, but is possible when an established, Christian public opinion, understandable to all, has arisen, to which the inert mass subjects itself, a mass which is not capable of arriving at truth by the inner path and is therefore always under the influence of public opinion. This public opinion however does not require centuries or milleniums for its origin, but has the capacity of suddenly laying hold upon the great mass."(1)

Tolstoy clearly recognizes the inadequacy of any evolutionary process to gradually, almost imperceptibly leaven the mass of society. His adhesion to the belief in a Kingdom of God on earth which could be "at hand" drove him inevitably to a modern type of apocalyptic. We should not mistake the genus because it appears in such different garments. The new spreads first in evolutionary fashion, but its supremacy and universality is to be established by some form of cataclysm. That is the crux, the water-shed, and so we find after all Tolstoy must be classed with the apocalyptists. We find support for such a wider use of the term in the Romanes lecture of Dean Inge, who deploras "the secularization of religion by throwing its ideals into the near future - a new apocalyptism which is doing mischief enough in politics without the help of the clergy." (2) He assures us on the contrary that the Church has never encouraged "the superstition of progress."

We believe that this brief survey of Christian history has revealed that wherever the Kingdom hope has been held fast, as distinct from the visible Church, and the universal propagation of the lofty demands of Jesus have been taken most literally



there has been the tendency to a revival of some form of apocalyptic. If one's inner evaluation of the person of Christ leads them to regard the Galilean as only a little greater personality than Tolstoy or Luther, or Augustine, it would be easier to draw the conclusion that we have strong evidence for an inner connection in the mind of Jesus. To one, (as the author) who believes that a Christology has a very different significance from a Lutherology, or other hero-worship, the conclusion may lack the same convincing power. But taken into consideration with our discussion of the Gospel tradition itself, it seems to us that the presumption is strong that his apocalyptic hopes went far to mould his ethical ideas. Whether that fact should prejudice us for or against him, is a distinct question to be answered for itself. As all questions of value, it admits of beliefs rather than demonstration.



## Chapter VII.

### SOCIALISM AND APOCALYPTIC.

It must never be forgotten that social-  
ism gives warning that life may be anticipated in the world  
by any one of a number of calamities. (1) But the resig-  
nation of this possibility will not hinder us from looking for-  
ward to the development of the institutions of humanity as  
such, irrespective of their present limitations, through a  
period to be marked by darkness and conflict of thousands  
of years.

Our most fruitful approach to the study of social  
reform in the apocalyptic literature will be through its contrast  
with the age of the enlightenment, a product of the age of reason  
and materialistic science. We refer of course to the  
enlightenment of the eighteenth century, and not to the  
enlightenment of the nineteenth century. In apocalyptic,



Is not the entire conception of catastrophe foreign to our thinking? Are we not posing an inherently inconsistent and impossible question to ask concerning the positive moral values in such an idea? In part these questions can be answered unhesitatingly in the affirmative. Despite the wide-spread prevalence of millennial hopes today among many unscientifically-minded Christians under the influence of the old idea of verbal inspiration, the categories of Jewish apocalyptic are as irrecoverable for the modern man as the Ptolemaic universe. Our perspective is widened so immeasurably, our confidence in the powers of the human intellect to ascertain the unseen, the transcendental, and the distant future so diminished, that these ideas can have little more than historical significance.

It must never be forgotten however that science itself gives warning that life may be extinguished in the world by any one of a number of cataclysms. (1) But the recognition of this possibility will not hinder us from looking forward to the development of the institutions of humanity on earth, circumscribed by their present limitations, through a period to be measured by thousands and hundreds of thousands of years.

Our most fruitful approach to the study of modern values in the apocalyptic element will be through its nearest equivalent in modern society, a product of the age of capitalism and materialistic science. We refer of course to Marxian socialism. The differences are undoubtedly great, but they effect the content rather than the form. In Apocalyptic,



(1) "Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion." page 137.

(2) "The Communist Manifesto" Marx and Engels.



God directs personally the great turning points of history. In Marxianism, God is politely bowed out of the universe as an evil fiction of the bourgeoisie class. This is only to erect in His place, the idol of economic determinism. But we come to the same conclusion as Baron von Hügel when he says, "Indeed recent Socialism, so largely Jewish in its origin, is full of a mostly quite non-religious millenarianism." (1) It is furthermore instructive to observe how frequently the type of mind that abhors mention of socialism stands at the farthest extreme from any modernized form of Apocalyptic.

We must at the outset recognize the two moods or tendencies discoverable in each. True apocalyptic expected the deliverance at the hands of God, without human activity. Beside it however was to be found the ze<sup>l</sup>ot movement which would force the hand of God and hasten the day by taking up the sword. So is it in socialism. In evolutionary socialism, the integration of the Capitalistic class and the progressive impoverishment of the proletariat must go on till the hour is ripe for socialization. But there has always been a revolutionary aspect as well, which preaches the class war, not only as an economic fact which the workers of the world must not forget, but as an aggressive act of violence to gain their rights. (2) The evolution of economic forms must be hastened by the assumption of power by the proletariat.

("Twist and turn it as man will, the theory of "the dictatorship of the proletariat has no place in the bounds of an historical-realistic exposition of socialism....One would have to imagine the very improbable case that all the conditions of the new society have been fulfilled and all that was necessary was to removed the small clique of political rulers who had the government in their hands. But then it would concern only a purely negative,



political system as in former times  
which was the main reason for the  
collapse of the system. The system  
was not able to cope with the  
new conditions and it was the  
main reason for the collapse of the  
system.

(1) Karl Marx, "Capital" (Eng. trans.) Vol. I  
pg. 227, 237, etc.



political removal of an outer form of the state; but a "dictatorship of the proletariat" with positive tasks would then have no meaning." Sombart, "Der Sozialismus und die Soziale Bewegung", pg. 79.)

When we come to details, the parallelism is marked. First of all, they agree in an extreme pessimistic judgment and criticism of the present order. The socialist brands all liberal attempts to palliate the evils of the capitalistic order as doomed from the outset, for the system presupposes the exploitation of the many by the few. The sin and misery of the present aeon have never been more effectively painted than in the evidence amassed in "Das Kapital", (1) of the greed and avarice of men enjoying the power of wealth. The form of this world must change. The implements of production must pass from private hands to those of the State. Private ownership must be abolished. No gradual alleviation of the ills of the present order will suffice for society is "totally depraved."

("Calmly and coolly we proclaim the doom of the capitalist system and of the capitalist class. Firmly and unflinchingly we herald the coming of the cooperative commonwealth of economically equal workers. Our voice is the conscious voice of history itself. Let the masters take heed and prepare! Let them stop the wheels of history if they can!" Ernest Unterman in "Marxian Economics.")

Apocalyptic spoke the same language in but varying phraseology. The present order of sin and suffering, of oppressors from without and oppressors from within, must pass away and God himself introduce the reign of righteousness.

Socialism knows its "signs of the end" as well as apocalyptic. If we were to paraphrase the ancient seer in terms of scientific Marxianism we might say, "When industry has reached extreme concentration and capital flowed into the hands



of a very few, when the misery of the workers has reached its greatest depth, when the productive power of industry has been so increased by rationalizing methods that a proper division of the profits would make leisure and comfort possible for all, then know ye that the hour of your deliverance is at hand." Marx believed that he could fore-tell the course of economic development. That history has proved many of his insights false, as well as to substantiate some of his bold intuitions, does not deter his disciples from re-editing the same signs of the end, and repeating the old phrases as did the apocalyptists with the traditional imagery that came to them.

One of the foremost "signs" ~~was the~~ "woes" of the last days, when the forces of evil should make a last great resistance, when the heavens should pour forth their wrath, and tribulation should cover the earth. This was the darkest hour which should precede the dawn, the birth-pangs of the coming aeon. Whoever has been horrified at the terrorism of Bolshevist Russia at the hands of those proclaiming a social paradise can best interpret this as a modern "messianic woe." The last vestiges of bourgeois capitalism must be rooted out by force before a socialist paradise is possible. The King, who rideth upon a white horse, whose eyes are a flame of fire and out of whose mouth proceedeth a sharp sword (Rev. 19:12, 19ff.) is waging the last conflict against the opposing hosts before the New Jerusalem comes down out of heaven.

We come to a more important point of agreement in the manner in which this change in the order of society is to be brought about. The individual can do nothing of himself. In



socialism the proletariat must unite and act together; in apocalyptic, God would himself bring the redemption. Thus within the great contrast lies a oneness in the powerlessness of the individual. No changes he might effect through his own activity could bring about the "complete otherness" of the new order. Suddenly it would be there. What individuals can do is proclaim its coming, and awaken the masses to their class consciousness and get them ready.

So again in the retreat of the ethical there is a parallelism. A prophet such as John the Baptist would insist, "Bring forth therefore fruit worthy of repentance; and think not to say within yourselves, 'We have Abraham to our father,' for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children to Abraham." (Mt. 3: 8-9) And I doubt not but that with many socialists, membership in the proletariat is not sufficient to be deserving of a place in the coming order. But as usual where class consciousness is exaggerated, it is the sins of the opponent that stand in the fore-ground. The coming aeon meant that Israel should rule over the heathen, the judgment and wrath of God should be poured out upon them for their oppression of God's people. And so in socialism. It has at times not hesitated to preach sabotage. It has eyes only for the sins of capitalists. Those that have been last shall be first, the proletariat will control the state, or better expressed, abolish the state. The brotherhood of both apocalyptic and socialism is intense, but restricted; it is not the brotherhood of man, but of the oppressed part of mankind.

In drawing these analogies, we have doubtless in



part been guilty of over-simplification. We have treated the general features of socialistic propaganda, ignoring for the moment the fact that some subject to this propaganda may be of a different nature. It will be necessary to make another study of the propaganda of socialistic propaganda and to make a study of the propaganda of socialistic propaganda and to make a study of the propaganda of socialistic propaganda.

- (1) The breakdown of international socialism under the national stress of the war does not alter this fact. Russian propaganda today proves conclusively the international character of socialism.

- (2) The labor-cost theory of value.



part been guilty of over-simplification. We have treated the general features of apocalyptic, ignoring for the moment the fact that Jesus cannot be thus classified except with very large reservations. It will be instructive however to note whether the agreements of Jesus with traditional apocalyptic are on the points noted above, and whether the <sup>socialists and Jesus</sup> agree together at any significant points against the ordinary apocalyptic scheme. It is an anachronism to ask whether Jesus was for or against socialism. Only minor points of contact and difference can be sought.

On one point at least Jesus is in accord with socialism in contrast to traditional apocalyptic. That is in his break with nationalism. We have seen that the coming Kingdom was for the righteous, not the Jews. The socialist heaven is not for the compatriots, but for the brother proletariat. While the internationalism of Jesus is but implicit, the internationalism of socialism is doctrinaire and polemic. (1) They are allies today therefore in combatting the national gods that form our chief contemporary idolatry. Likewise, socialism judges greatness in terms of service instead of the exercise of authority. True, it values economic service to the practical exclusion of all other. It is to be granted that its economics makes the false attempt to judge service by the time it takes the worker, rather than the resultant value of the community. (2) But both unhesitatingly attack those who live at the expense of others rather than through some contribution to society.

Jesus is likewise in accord with that wing of the socialist parties which is avowedly pacifist. Ordinary apoc-



(1) This will of course be contested by the militaristic interpreters of Jesus. We do not mean by our sentence to characterize "Jesus's attitude toward war". Jesus's attitude toward a messianic war of deliverance is clear. He is not laying down rules to govern compromises with the institutions of this world because their course is soon to end.

The passages usually cited to ground an appeal to force in Jesus, will not bear the weight of the load they are asked to carry. It is ludicrous to conclude from John 2:15, that it was the whip of cords of one man rather than His commanding personality, that drove out the money changers. Though Matthew 10:34 does say "Think not that I came to send peace on the earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword"; it is clear from the illustrations that follow that the strife is not military. Rather, families are divided. The parallel in Luke says "division", and that is most certainly the more original. With this word is to be classed the words found only in Luke about the preparations which the disciples will need for the very difficult time which was to come for them. (Lk. 22:36-8) That Jesus was contemplating armed resistance is contradicted by the whole account, or that his disciples were to take up the sword, by the attitude of all the early Church toward persecution. It is rather proverbial for being fully prepared for every emergency. That he assures them two swords is enough, proves that the word was not to be taken literally. (See J. Weiss, "Schriften des Neuen Testament, and Klosterman, "Handbuch zum Neuen Testament" on the passages in question.)



apocalyptic gave large place to messianic wars. The overthrow of the evil powers was to come in a great war. Jesus however rejected all appeal to force, (1) and in his apocalyptic descriptions of the time to come, such a messianic war is conspicuously absent. The socialist parties who in pursuance of brotherhood have adopted the slogan, "No More War", have the same general outlook. But the revolutionary socialists who not only assert the fact of the "class war" but preach it with virulence in season and out, present a marked contrast to Jesus. It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that a war between classes is essentially no more immoral than one between states. Both have economic roots. It comes therefore with poor consistency for the advocates of nationalist preparedness to condemn the immorality of "the class war". Only the pacifist can logically attack this denial of human brotherhood.

But the points of dissimilarity are none the less real, and they are likewise where Jesus breaks with ordinary apocalyptic. The ethical inwardness of Jesus we have seen to stand beside his radicalism. It was not the signs of the times that should receive the focus of the individual's <sup>attention,</sup> but his own personal relation to God and his fellow-men, that love to God and man that fitted one for citizenship in the new Kingdom. Socialism lacks such an ethical inwardness, such an appeal to the individual's motivation, such a call to personal repentance. Changes in the economic order without the individual are the precursors of a new day. Jesus calls rather for the repudiation of covetousness and of the worship of Mammon on the part of the individual.



(1) Luke 12:14.

(2) Rauschenbush, "Social Principles of Jesus" is one of the best examples of these. They<sup>books</sup> are essentially practical rather than historical.

(3) This must not be taken as a contradiction to what has been said about the speeches on "light".



Jesus did not lead an attack upon economic injustice. Indeed, the Gospels leave us in comparative ignorance as to the economic clashes in Palestine in the first century. Jesus emphatically rejected the role of a "divider of goods." (1) He did so, not because he had less sympathy for the poor and oppressed than those who have read wide social consequences into his religious principles. (2) Jesus did however give a religious evaluation of poverty that is scarcely understandable to the socialistic materialist. Jesus was not interested in transforming the economic institutions of his day despite the injustice there may have been, because that order was soon to pass away and inward preparedness was the essential thing. For those "spiritually-minded" individuals who attempt therefore today to divorce religion from business, and transfer all hopes of betterment from the present economic order to a transcendental heaven, it should suffice to recall that this Kingdom was to come on earth. At that time the hungry should be fed, etc. But under the philosophy of apocalyptic, **reform** could not institute these changes; one must await the great divine intervention. (3)

But there is one fundamental point of agreement; both socialism and Jesus know a decisive hour in history. For the one it is the hour of socialization; for the other, the great denouement when God's Kingdom shall come. The hopes that thrilled the working people of Europe, so largely socialist, ~~xxx Europe~~ with the coming of President Wilson in 1919 were truly messianic. In socialism, our age has an apocalyptic ferment that makes the obsolete background of Jesus more



understandable today. This insight does not mean that the modern Christian should be a socialist. He is much more apt to reject that also because of its catastrophic leanings. Rather we should be led on to inquire as to whether there are not values here to which we have not given full place.



## Chapter VIII.

## MODERN VALUES IN APOCALYPTIC ESCHATOLOGY.



We must now frankly face the question of the value of apocalyptic for our own day. That is not a question for historical verification it must be admitted, but enters the subjective field of personal evaluation. Our tastes have nothing to do with what has been. When Dean Inge asserts, "We could take no interest in a deluded Jewish peasant, who, believing that the world was coming to an end, preached only an interim-ethik of no value to world which had thousands of years before it" (Outspoken Essays II. pg. 53) that is his personal opinion based on the gratuitous assumption that an "interim-ethik" was in its nature as such, of no value. But our interest does not determine what the past has been.

We can hardly find a better starting point than Dean Inge's essay in which he describes our modern evolutionary belief in progress as a "superstition", but as of some value as a present-day expression of the Christian virtue of hope. The apocalyptist did not believe in progress by evolution any more than ~~does~~ Dean Inge. He did believe that our ideals were present actualities in heaven, just as the gloomy Dean who has drunk so deeply at the fount of Platonic idealism believes in the eternal verities of truth, beauty, and goodness. But the apocalyptist held yet a third world view in that he still clung to the hope of the realization of these pre-existent ideals on earth. He united a radical pessimism concerning the present evil order of things with an extravagant optimism as to what God's will could bring to pass.

Though "the superstition of progress" may seem to







afford to the average Anglo-Saxon mind the most plausible nursery of hope, it must be admitted that it is a child of (1) the modern world, and only a part of that. Where outward signs point to progressive deterioration, there is no encouragement in the idea of evolution. That could only lead still farther into the abyss. A right-about face can alone inaugurate the new day. The evolution of the present forces at work in Europe well illustrate this point. No German is today preaching faith in the gradual progress of society. Apocalypses have been aptly termed "tracts for hard times". In hard times, apocalyptic affords apparently the only escape from ultimate pessimism, unless we retreat entirely from the field of history into the impenetrable recesses of the human soul, where God may be enjoyed forever and the world is given over to permanent despair.

As a form of belief in progress, apocalypticism is a perpetual challenge to reactionary conservatism. It is unnecessary to raise the philosophical problems in the idea of change. The apocalyptists were not subtle metaphysicians - certainly Jesus was not - but the bearers of great religious convictions. The institutions of humanity were not "that which hath been, is now, and ever shall be, world without end." The present order was depraved. It must suffer radical changes. Not only must there come new and better men, but a new and better world in which they might live - a divine order. The fanatical hatred that mars so much of the late Jewish apocalyptic literature is due just to this - it opposed all reactionary conservatism, and thereby drew to its



standard political and social malcontents.

This form of hope likewise cuts loose from all mechanism. The word attributed to Jesus in the Fourth Gospel, "My Kingdom does not come from this world" is at least in conformity with his conception of its arrival. The Kingdom of God would not organically grow out of the present order. No evolutionary differentiation or integration of preceding elements could account for it. Apocalyptic assumes "the law of arrival". The Kingdom comes from heaven. There is no denying that this runs counter to the scientific temper of our age. Based as it is upon the laws of universal causality and the conservation of energy, scientific investigation accords no place to "new arrivals" or "uncaused forces". But apocalyptic must not be presented as obsolete science any more than as crude metaphysics. It represents a religious conviction. God is not exhausted in the present natural scheme. Apocalyptic tended to make God external to the world, and lose His immanence in the thought of transcendence. This was not so of Jesus, for whom the lilies of the field were an expression of the beauty of God and even the sparrows an object of His paternal care. Mechanism, however, is definitely repudiated. Apocalyptic teaches new beginnings - and with that the modern world is in vital sympathy. We crave a justification of the creative power of human spirit as opposed to universal mechanism, and an endless chain of causality. Apocalyptic boldly affirms the creative power of God to "make all things new".

Apocalyptic cuts the nerve of all pantheism by its proclamation of a coming Kingdom of God. Apocalyptic is mon-



istic enough to assert the ultimate triumph of good, when "God shall be all in all", but is pluralistic enough to take seriously the fact of evil. Rationalism in religion not infrequently drives men to an essential pantheism, which is the worship of the God-of-things-as-they-are. When God is identified with His world and found in every part of it, there is no foundation for a coming Kingdom. Pantheism levels all things down, not up. The futurism which declares that "what is" must be overcome and superseded by the will of God is a death-blow to all pantheism.

Our age is the day of the "social gospel", of the social passion, of socialized religion. This popular catchword emphasizes a central factor in religion, but all-too-frequently is used as a blind to hide disbelief in a personal God and a personal experience of fellowship in worship. Apocalyptic should commend itself to the modern mind as containing genuine values, in that it is a "social" hope in contrast to the purely individual outlook. Eternal life can belong to the isolated individual, but the resurrection as the prelude to participation in a divine order is a social hope. The good and abundant life, according to the apocalypticist, was not to be lived in isolation, even in eternity, but was the coming of a heavenly order to earth, in which men were raised together for participation. The recession of the Kingdom hope before the idea of going to heaven is succinctly stated by Volz. "The teaching of the new age becomes the message of salvation; 'the Beyond' is a local, no longer a temporal idea. Heaven no longer needs to come to earth since man goes



(1) Paul Volz, "Jüdische Eschatologie", pg. 161



to heaven. Eternity is the time after death; the first and second aeon become this and that life; what was the Parousia is now the approach of death". (1)

The distinctly modern conception of the Kingdom of God as the organic product of our own moral endeavors goes hand in hand with the extreme secularization of religion. "Social" immortality" is for most either the "immortality of influence" or a return of our finite consciousness to the infinite world consciousness. But here and now we should "taste the powers of the age to come". As our fore-taste is a social order, so the coming age will be a social order. A truly social view of immortality must be founded upon an individualism. The apocalyptic circle of ideas mediates that conception to the modern mind in its own way.

Apocalyptic grounds an "heroic" ethic, not a practical system or moral code. We are safe in affirming that a philosophical system of ethics would never have transformed the world. Ethical maxims do not instill ethical power. Systems explain conduct but do not originate over-powering enthusiasms. If our age desires moral passion we are unwise in belittling any major element contributing to the "heroic ethic" of Jesus. As Troeltsch points out in his masterly delineation, what Jesus calls for "Is a **change** in values altogether, not an apportionment to the power of God of the organization of those values within the world which are not attainable by men..... Jesus' ethic is heroic rather than ascetic. It tempers its heroism only through the tenderness of the religious trust in God and belief in forgiveness, but not through compromise



(1) E. Troeltsch, "Die Soziallehre der Christliche Kirche". Pg. 40.

(2) A. Schweitzer, "Christianity and the Religions of the World". Pg. 36.



with the demands of the worldly life and the "nature of things".....So little as these demands can be deduced from the expectation of the end itself, even by so much must one consider that their radicalism and unconcernedness with their possibility and practicability are to be understood only from this standpoint". (1) Jesus was world-denying as well as world-affirming, for the world he was affirming was one yet to come.

After twenty centuries of so-called Christianity men are asking the question more seriously than ever before, "Dare we be Christians?" Our sobered world is more keenly aware of the antithesis between modern industrialism, the nationalistic sovereign states, and the message of Jesus. Can these Kingdoms be made the Kingdoms of Christ even if we grant an endless stretch of time? Can we seriously adopt the ethic of Jesus? The radical exponent of "consequent eschatology" points out the way of understanding. "Jesus did not build up his ethic with a view to solving the problem of how to organize a perfectly ethical society, but he preaches the ethic of men who together strive to attain to a perfect yielding of themselves to the will of God. Because he thus turns away from the utilitarian, he attains to the absolute ethic. An ethic which is formulated on a principle of utility is always relative." (2)

No phrase has been so grossly misinterpreted as that of "interim-ethic". It was perhaps an unfortunate designation by the eschatologists to characterize the ethical demands which would mark true repentance. The real interim-ethic is rather that which exists "because of the hardness of men's hearts."



(1) Wundt, "System der Ethik" 332 ff.



Systems of Christian ethics usually result in a "practical" compromise with the institutions of the world as it stands. Such are, in the nature of the case, purely relative to temporary conditions. An absolute ethic can only come in connection with a vision of the ideal world. "But ideals can only arise as ideas in whose reality or whose realization we can believe." The apocalyptic kingdom hope gave that vision of an ideal world. "Without this firm faith in the coming Messiah, the ethic of early Christendom would not have become what it was, the ideal of life of a man in a complete forgetfulness of self in devotion to humanity." (1)

Such a superhuman ideal frees Christianity from all legalism. Old Testament morality was frankly a law. Jesus was not even pretending to offer a law for a perfect society. He does reveal the absolute boundlessness of the moral spirit in the practice of love. The "lex Christi" must therefore always be an illusion. Religion is not law, but fellowship with God in doing His will. That requires the freedom of the sons of God. Apocalyptic was historically the mould in which an absolute moral ideal, freed from all legalism, was given to the world. That must not be belittled by a world which follows other approaches.

Apocalyptic is an attempted solution of the problem of evil. That it is not completely successful will be charged against it only by those shallow minds who have yet to discover that it is an intellectually insoluble problem. Apocalyptic has this merit that it takes evil seriously, and attempts to relate that fact to the reality of the goodness of God. An



(1) Lewissohn "Upstream".

(2) See Beckwith "The Idea of God" pg. 209 ff. for a discussion of various presentations.

(3) From another standpoint, Heim builds upon the irrational in religion in his great work, "Glaubensgewissheit".  
Leipzig, 1920.



age that has produced Christian Science, which makes of evil nothing but error of mortal mind, has something to learn in this regard. An age that frequently satisfies itself with the comfort that some evil is necessary to moral struggle, or that boldly affirms evil to be good in the making, needs an antidote in order to take the wickedness of sin more seriously. Of course the problem does not exist for that large number who see just in this evil order of things proof that a God of ethical will is simply our dream wish, "the kind of gesture by which a man tries to ward off blows he is too weak to endure". (1)

The idea of a finite God is popular today. (2) It seems to be the logical solution of the two series of evidences, evil on the one hand, and an ethical God on the other. But a finite God can never satisfy the deepest longings of the religious spirit. If religion cannot give men certainty as to the validity of the ideal, it has ceased to be fruitful. Though apocalyptic is in a sense dualistic, it never loses grip upon the absolute sovereignty of God's holy will. Its great affirmation is the confident assertion that the Kingdom is at hand. The rational uniting of a sovereign God of Holy Will with the real presence of evil to be overcome is as impossible a philosophical task, as they are positive data of religious experience. Here we confront the truly irrational in religion that Rudolph Otto has discussed with such illumination in "Das Heilige". (3)

The Parousia expectation did not rest on fanaticism, but on belief in God's holy will. If to secular minds of our scientific age it indicates a tinge of insanity, - if not more - that is because we share such radically different premises.



(1) A. Otto, "Das Heilige" pg. 8.

(2) Boljer, "The Great Hunger".



According to the apocalyptist, God must vindicate His ethical purpose in a great act of redemption. Jesus purged this expectation of every element of revenge, and from its association with exclusive national glory. The sovereignty of God's holy will upon earth was certain because of the omnipotence of God. To realize that will in place of the present sinful order, catastrophe was postulated as well as evolution.

We cannot overlook the element of determinism that lies in apocalyptic. We are thoroughly accustomed to the determinism of science, the mechanistic view of life with which apocalyptic affords so radical a break. Ethical teachers have wrestled in vain with the problem of free will, its speculative possibility and its existence in practice. Apocalyptic is religious determinism. If we are to grant with Schleiermacher that the feeling of utter dependence is the basis of religion, nothing is more religious. Man can prepare for, but God must usher in the new Kingdom. Apocalyptic cultivates a truly "creature-feeling". (1)

This is frankly contrary to the modern spirit that deifies the constructive power of the human mind. Philosophers such as John Dewey seem to assume that we can make of the future just what we determine. The only boundaries lie in the utilization which we make of our intelligence. "I am the master of my fate". With Peer Holm men say, "The day will come when we shall no longer need to pray. The hour will strike when the Heavenly potentates will be forced to capitulate and in their turn bend the knee to us." Our own acts have a part in the "creation of God", the only God worthy of the name. This



is our salvation from the determinism of a blind fate.

Apocalyptic opposes this with the determinism of God's holy will. Its outlook is too rigid. It may not altogether untruly be charged with being "inverted mechanism". Jesus leaves it entirely untheoretical. Human determinism<sup>is</sup> no more explained than that in nature. But the fact remains that evil trees cannot produce good fruit. The mystery of the Kingdom was not revealed unto all, but the appeal to repent is given as if it were possible for all to participate in the heavenly Kingdom which God would set up. Once more we are face to face with one of the fundamental irrationalities of religion.

We cannot close a discussion of the values in apocalyptic without stumbling upon the great stone of offense, that Jesus was mistaken in the belief that he would come again soon as Messiah. For many, no values can possibly off-set the fact that if Jesus should prove to have been mistaken on that point, he was but a deluded fanatic, not the Son of God. It is unnecessary to recount again the evidence which cannot be explained away. Though repudiating any attempt to set the day or hour, which was known only to God Himself (Mk. 13:32), he was certain that some of those with him should witness "the Kingdom of God come with power." (Mk. 9:1) The intellectual gymnastics by which interpreters have endeavored to ~~the~~ avoid the conclusion that he was mistaken in this is a disgrace to the sincerity of his followers.

It should be made clear in this connection that apocalyptic eschatology has nothing to do with premillennialism. The



thousand year reign of the martyrs (Rev. 20:4) predicted by the author of the Apocalypse to precede the final judgment and the coming of the New Jerusalem is an adaptation of the Jewish belief in the "days of the Messiah". It was a uniting of the old prophetic eschatology with the more transcendental ideas first witnessed in the Book of Daniel. Jesus's prediction of his early coming as the Messiah had nothing to do with a millennial reign of martyrs. The Kingdom of God followed the judgment. There can be no possible accommodation of the eschatology of the Synoptics and Apocalypse to each other. Literalism only reveals the discrepancies. When we assert therefore that Jesus was mistaken about his early return, we are not ascribing to him disappointed millennial dreams.

It is one of the five slogans of Fundamentalism to affirm belief in the imminent return of Jesus. Those who deny the fundamentalist position frequently weaken themselves by attempting to affirm that Jesus did not predict his early coming. They ask, "When did Jesus ever go away?", and quote, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them" (Mt. 18:20) and passages from John giving his spiritualized view of the eternal presence of the living Christ. But the truth of this great fact of religious experience must not blind us to the meaning of texts which go beyond it. That the disciples found an ever-present Lord - the part that Greek ideas played in the realization of that experience we can leave to the controversialists - does not alter their previous expectation based on the current messianism utilized by Jesus. The literalists in the fundamentalist camp,







reading the Gospels more accurately than some of their liberal brethren and admitting no possibility of "mistakes", simply transfer the "imminence" of that return to our own day.. They can be proved wrong only with the frank admission that <sup>the</sup> expectation of Jesus was false, though the truth was realized in another way.

To speak of the value of an illusion seems to be a contradiction in terms. Jesus was certainly possessed of the "passion for reality". But an illusion is not only that. It was a mistaken belief of Jesus that the messianic scheme, even in his moralized presentation, should come to pass. It was not an illusion that his followers should continue to look unto him for personal leadership. He was not mistaken in his trust in God, in his judgment of sin, or in his belief in salvation. These are the corner-stones of faith. These can be overturned as little by a mistaken belief in an imminent Parousia, as by the sharing in the scientific and cosmological ideas of his day.

Dr. Horton has used a suggestive phrase which summarizes the Christian ideal better than the "imitatio Christi". (1) The world needs a "commixtatio Christi". We need the creative fellowship of heroes. We do not reverence them by a re-awakening of even productive illusions. "The evangelization of the world in this generation" will hasten no divine intervention. We are summoned to the ethical radicalism of Jesus - to the Christianization of the world - which is a task for countless generations. An eternal guide and Savior would not be found in the promulgator of "practical" legal arrangements for an order of compromise and sin. Jesus is the inspirer of an



ethical religion of redemption. He does not save simply from mortality and decay. He aims to redeem a sinful society. Apocalyptic eschatology afforded historically the stimulus for belief in the nearness of that saved society. Bathed in the light of its vision, <sup>Jesus</sup> ~~He~~ radiates for us an unconquerable hope in its realization. He gives us a renewed trust in God, who was the ultimate ground of his confidence, as He must be of our own. Science has borne testimony as to method in the universe. That is also divine revelation. But it has not advanced our realization of God's character. He remains for us, as for Paul, best illumined as "The Father of our Lord Jesus Christ."



# BIBLIOGRAPHY

No effort is made in the following list to name all of the books in the relative fields. Only those that have been actually used at some period in the preparation of the thesis are enumerated, and except in cases of volumes quoted in the body of the thesis, only those applying directly to the New Testament problem investigated. The relative articles in the standard Bible Dictionaries such as Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels, Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart, etc. are not specifically cited. The pseudepigrapha have been used both in the edition by Charles and that edited by Kautzsch.

- Abbott, E. A. "The Proclamation of the New Kingdom."
- Albertz, M. "Die Synoptischen Streitgespräche". Berlin, 1921.
- Allen, W. C. "International Critical Commentary to Matthew" 1907.
- Bachman, Phillip, "Die Sittenlehre Jesu und ihre Bedeutung für die Gegenwart" 1904
- Baldensperger, W. "Die Messianische-Apokalyptischen Hoffnungen des Judentums". 1903 3 Auf.
- Barth, F. "Die Hauptprobleme des Lebens Jesu" 5 Auf. 1918.
- Berguet, M. G. "Some Aspects of the Life of Jesus". 1923.
- Bernoulli C. A. "Johannes der Täufer" Leipzig, 1919.
- Bertholet, A. "Die Jüdische Religion von der Zeit Ezras bis zum Zeitalter Christi".
- Boehmer, J. "Der Rahmen des Reiches Gottes". 1909.
- Boussett W. "Jesus" 1904  
"Die Religion des Judentums in Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter" Berlin 1906.  
"Kyrios Christos" 1913  
"Jesus, der Herr" 1916
- Box, G. H. "Fourth Ezra".
- Bruce, A. B. "The Training of the Twelve" 1889  
"Matthew, Mark, and Luke" in "The Expositor's Greek Testament".
- Burkitt, F. C. "The Earliest Sources for the Life of Jesus Christ". 1910.
- Bultman, R. "Die Geschichte der Synoptischen Tradition". 1921.
- Bury, J. B. "The Idea of Progress".



- Case, S. H. "The Evolution of Early Christianity" 1914.
- Charles, R. H. "A Critical History of the Doctrine of a Future Life in Esraël, in Judaism, and in Christianity". 1899
- Clutton-Brock, C. "What is the Kingdom of Heaven" 1919.
- Couard, L. "Die Religiösen und Sittlichen Anschauungen der Alttestamentlichen Apokryphen und Psuedepigraphen" 1907
- Dalman, G. "Die Worte Jesu". 1898
- Dewick, E. C. "Primitive Christian Eschatology" 1912
- Dibelius, M. "Formgeschichte des Evangeliums" 1919
- von Dobschütz, E. "The Eschatology of the Gospels" 1910.
- Duhm, B. "Das Kommende Reich Gottes" 1910.
- Ehrhardt, E. "Der Grundcharakter der Ethik Jesu im Verhältniss zu den messianischen Hoffnungen seines Volkes und seinen eignen Messianischen Bewusstsein" 1895
- Emmet, C. with Lilly Dougall "The Lord of Thought" 1922
- "The Eschatological Question in the Gospels" 1911.
- > Everett, "Moral Values"
- > Fairweather, "The Background of the Gospels" 1908
- Feine, P. "Die Theologie des Neuen Testaments" 3 Auf. 1919
- Fiebig, F. "Die Gleichnisreden Jesu in Lichte der Rabbinischen Gleichnisse." Tübingen, 1912
- Friedlander, G. "Jewish Sources of the Sermon on the Mount" 1911
- Friedlander, M. "Die Religiösen Bewegungen innerhalb des Judentums im Zeitalter Jesu" Berlin 1905.
- Garvie, A. E. "Studies in the Inner Life of Jesus" 1907
- Gilbert, G. H. "The Student's Life of Jesus". 1900



- Glover, T. R. "The Jesus of History" 1917
- Grimm, E. "Die Ethik Jesu" 2. Auf. 1917.
- Gry, Leon "Les Parables D' Hénoch et Leur Messianisme"  
Paris, 1910.
- Harnack, A. "Das Wesen der Christentum" 1900  
"The Sayings of Jesus" 1908  
"Das Mönchtum"
- Headlam, A. C. "The Life and Teachings of Jesus". 1923
- Heiler, Fr. "Das Gebet" 3. Auf. 1921
- Heinrici, G. "Ist Die Lebenslehre Jesu Zeitmässig" 1904
- Heitmüller, W. "Jesus" 1913
- Hermann, W. "Ethik"
- Hogg, A. G. "Christ's Message of the Kingdom" 1911
- Holland, H. Scott, "The Real Problem of Eschatology" 1916
- Holtzman, H. J. "Lehrbuch der Neutestamentlichen Theologie"  
Vol. I 2. auf. 1911  
"Handkommentar zum Synoptischen Evangelien".
- Holtzman, O. "Das Leben Jesu" 1901
- Horton, R. H. "The Mystical Quest of Christ" 1923
- von Hügel, Baron F. "The Eschatological Problem" in "Essays  
and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion"  
1921
- Hughes, H. M. "The Ethics of the Jewish Apocalyptic  
Literature", 1912.  
"The Kingdom of Heaven" 1922
- Inge, W. R. "Outspoken Essays" II 1922
- Jakoby, H. "Neutestamentliche Ethik" 1899
- Jülicher, A. "Einleitung in das Neue Testament" 1906  
"Gleichnisreden Jesu". I, 1888. II, 1899.
- King, H. C. "The Ethics of Jesus". 1910
- Kirn, O. "Die Sittlichen Forderungen Jesu" 1910



- Klausner, J. "Die Messianischen Vorstellungen des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter der Tannaiten" Berlin 1904
- Klostermann E. "Handbuch zum Neuen Testament"  
with H. Gressman Markus 1907  
Matthaus 1909  
Lukas 1919
- Loisy, A. "Jesus et la Tradition Evangelique" Paris, 1910.
- Lake, K. and F. J. Foakes-Jackson. "The Beginning of Christianity." Vol. I. 1920
- Loofs, Fr. "The Truth about Jesus Christ". 1916
- Manson, Wm. "Christ's View of the Kingdom of God". 1918
- Mathews, S. "The Social Teachings of Jesus" 1908  
"The Messianic Hope in the New Testament" 1905
- Marx, K. with Engels, "The Communist Manifesto"  
"Capital"
- Metzger, Paul, "Der Begriff des Reiches Gottes im Neuen Testament" 1910
- Meyer, E. "Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums"  
Vol. I, 1920 Vol. II, 1922
- Moffatt, James "Introduction to the Literature of the N. T." 1915  
"The Theology of the Gospels" 1913
- Montefiori, C. G. "The Synoptic Gospels" 1909
- >Muirhead "The Eschatology of Jesus".
- Oesterley, W. O. E. "Judaism in the Days of Christ".
- Otto, R. "Das Heilige" 8 Auf. 1922.
- Peabody, F. G. "Jesus Christ and the Social Question" 1904  
"New Testament Eschatology and New Testament Ethics", in the Transactions of the Third International Congress of Historical Religions. 1908.
- Plummer, A. International Critical Commentary to "Luke" 1901



- Preisker, H. "Die Ethik der Evangelien und die Jüdische Apokalyptik" 1915
- Preisker, M. "Troeltsch's Darstellung der Soziallehren des Evangeliums" Neutestamentliche Forschungen. Sonderheft der Theologischen Studien.
- Rauschenbusch, W. "Christianity and the Social Crisis" 1907  
"The Social Principles of Jesus" 1915
- Renan, E. "La Vie de Jesus"
- Sanday, Wm. "The Life of Christ in Recent Research".  
editor "Outlines of the Life of Christ"  
"Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem" 1911
- Scheler, Max "Der Formalismus in der Ethik und die Materiale Wertethik" 1921
- Schmidt, K. L. "Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu" 1919
- Schürer, E. "Geschichte der Jüdisches Volkes" IV Auf. 1909
- Schweitzer, A. "Leben Jesu Forschung" II Auf. 1913.  
"Christianity and the Religions of the World" 1923
- Scott, E. F. "The Kingdom and the Messiah" 1911
- Smith, David "The Days of His Flesh" 8th edition 1910
- Soiron, P. T. "Die Logia Jesu" 1916
- Sombart, W. "Sozialismus und Soziale Bewegung" 1920
- Spitta, F. "Die Synoptische Grundschrift" 1912
- Stalker, James, "The Ethic of Jesus" 1909
- Stevens, G. B. "The Teaching of Jesus" 1901
- Streeter, B. E. (editor) "Foundations"
- Simkhovitch, V. "Toward the Understanding of Jesus" 1921
- Temple, Wm. "The Kingdom of God". 1912
- Titius, A. "Die Neutestamentlicher Lehre von der Seligkeit." I. 1895
- Tolstoy, Leo. "My Confession"  
"The Kingdom of God is Within You."



- Troeltsch, E. "Grundprobleme der Ethik" in "Gesammelte Schriften" I, pg. 552-672, 1913.
- "Die Soziallehre der Christliche Kirche" 1919
- Tyrrell, George "Christianity at the Cross-Roads" 1910
- Unterman, E. "Marxian Economics"
- Volz, Paul, "Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba" 1903
- Vedder, H. C. "Socialism and the Ethics of Jesus" 1914.
- Weinel, H. "Jesus im 19 Jahrhundert" 1914.  
"Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments" 3 Auf.  
1921
- Weiss, J. "Die Predigt Jesu vom Reiche Gottes" 1900 2 Auf.  
"Die Idee des Reiches Gottes in der Theologie" 1901  
"Das Älteste Evangelium" 1903  
"Das Urchristentum" 1914  
"Die Schriften des Neuen Testament" 1917 2 Auf.  
edited by W. Boussett
- Weiss, K. "Exegetisches zur Irrtumlosigkeit und Eschatologie  
Jesu Christi" 1916
- Wellhausen, J. Das Evangelium Marci 1903  
Das Evangelium Matthaei 1904  
"Einleitung in der drei Ersten Evangelien"  
2 Auf. 1911
- Wendling, E. "Die Entstehung des Markus Evangeliums" 1908
- Wendt, E. H. "The Teachings of Jesus" 2 vol. 1892
- Wernle, Paul "Die Synoptische Frage" 1899  
"Die Anfänge unserer Religion" 1901  
"Jesus" 1916
- Wrede, W. "Das Messiasgeheimnis in den Evangelien" 1901
- Wundt, W. "System der Ethik" II.
- Zahn, T. "Einleitung in das Neue Testament" I, 1897, II, 1899.  
"Kommentar zum Mattheus Evangelium". 1903

We desire to acknowledge our indebtedness to the instruction and helpful friendship of Professors Lowstuter and Knudson in



Boston University, Lake and Ropes in Harvard University, Goetz and Wernle in Basel University, and Professors Deissmann and Troeltsch<sup>in Berlin</sup>, whose courses have all been found helpful in the preparation of this thesis. Also for personal interviews with Professor Bultman and Otto in Marburg, von Dobschütz in Halle, Weinel in Jena, and Emmett and Streeter in Oxford University.



CLARENCE TUCKER CRAIG

Brief Autobiography

- - - - -

Born June 7, 1895, at Benton Harbor, Michigan.

Names of parents: Rev. Alfred Edwin Craig and Mrs. Clara Tucker Craig.

Attended public schools in Ottumwa, Iowa; Columbus, Ohio; Columbus East High School, and Wilmington, Delaware, Friends' School.

Entered Morningside College, Sioux City, Iowa, and received A.B. degree in 1915.

Taught, Anglo-Chinese College, Foochow, China, 1915-16.

Received S.T.B. from Boston University School of Theology, June, 1919.

Graduate study in Boston University, Harvard University, Basel University and Berlin University. Received Ph.D. from Boston University, 1924.



BOSTON UNIVERSITY  
1 1719 01784 9730

**Do not remove**  
charge slip from this pocket  
if slip is lost please return book  
directly to a circulation staff member.



**Boston University Libraries**  
771 Commonwealth Avenue  
Boston, Massachusetts 02215

